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### Transportation Topic Analysis

Aaron Hardy and Jim Hanson, Whitman College

**Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its transportation infrastructure investment in the United States.**

This essay will discuss the wording of the 2012-2013 Transportation debate topic. This year you can look forward to debates about the crumbling US highway infrastructure, port security, high-speed rail, and even space tourism. The vast range of proposals for improving and expanding US transportation infrastructure ensure a dynamic, interesting topic with many affirmative solvency mechanisms and negative responses. Consider, for example, affirmative cases which invest in improving America’s bridge infrastructure, that construct a nationwide high-speed rail network, or that construct an elevator to space. Are you ready for these affirmatives? Use this analysis as an introduction to the topic and to guide your research. Identify areas of the topic you are already strong on, and those that require more research and study. This topic analysis can both help you select the affirmative case you will advocate, as well as prepare negative responses to the variety of affirmative cases that will be run this year.

**Words in the Resolution**

**The United States federal government**

The agent in this year’s resolution is the United States federal government. The federal government is chosen as the actor for policy debate topics because it is the policymaking body with jurisdiction over the entire United States. Limiting the debate to the actions of one central governmental body allows a limited range of possible affirmative plans and allows negative teams to predict and craft the best responses. Because the actions of the government are so highly scrutinized, major pieces of legislation, judicial review and executive action are widely discussed in topic literature. On the Transportation topic in particular, the federal government is the most logical agent of choice because it is the governmental body which is in charge of coordinating the nationwide transportation infrastructure. The most accepted definition of the United States federal government is: “the Government which, from its capital in the District of Columbia, directly legislates, administers, and exercises jurisdiction." Under this interpretation, the federal government is made up of its legislative, executive, and judicial branches. This means that, as is the case for most affirmative plans, Congress passes a law, the President enforces it, and the Supreme Court would uphold it as Constitutional were it to be challenged.

Black’s Law Dictionary provides a broader definition of the federal government: “The system of government administered in a nation formed by the union or confederation of several independent states.” This definition allows affirmatives to specify a single agent within the United States federal government. For example, an affirmative plan might have the President issue an executive order for federal infrastructure funds to be spent on rural highways, or the Congress might pass a piece of legislation funding the development of sustainable rail networks. Because affirmative solvency evidence often advocates action by a particular branch of government, affirmatives may find it necessary to defend this particular interpretation of what the federal government should mean.

**Should**

The most common definition of the word “should” is that it is “used to express obligation or duty: You should send her a note.” Thus, “should” is used to express the idea that someone or some thing ought to take a particular course of action. Here, it is important to note that the action in question will not necessarily happen. It merely ought to take place; this is no guarantee that it actually will. The affirmative’s power of “fiat” is derived from this word in the resolution. “Fiat” is the Latin expression for “let it be done.” This has an important implication for policy debate: affirmative cases need not prove that the plan would happen, merely that it should. In other words, the affirmative need not prove that the federal government would choose to endorse their plan today, but rather only must prove that if the federal government were to adopt the affirmative plan, the results would be favorable. This allows affirmatives to sidestep most (but not all) questions of the plan’s passage and implementation (while affirmatives need not prove that the government would endorse their plan, they still must prove that it would be effective and functional if it were endorsed). Thus, the point of an affirmative case is to prove that the federal government should endorse their plan, i.e., that the affirmative plan is the best possible course of action.

**Substantially**

The word “substantially” is notoriously difficult to define with precision, yet it is still very important in the construction of a debate topic. “Substantially” is intended to provide a check on the scope and magnitude of affirmative plans, preventing affirmatives from merely changing minute aspects of the status quo that negatives cannot be predict or prepare arguments against. If affirmatives could change any aspect of transportation infrastructure, regardless of scope, then a topical affirmative case could repair one highway in Indiana and claim an advantage relative to the status quo. Since the effect of one road would be infinitesimally small (yet still an improvement over the status quo), the negative in this debate would have little ground.

Many teams attempt to define “substantially” numerically. For example, a “substantial” amount might be taken to be anywhere from 10% to 90%. These definitions, however, merely beg the question, “10% of what?” Should affirmatives have to increase the amount of money spent on transportation infrastructure by 10%? Should the plan affect 10% of current infrastructure? These are the problems that plague numerical definitions of the word “substantial.” Moreover, most numerical definitions are taken from particular Supreme Court cases that have little relevance to transportation policy. Thus, numerical definitions are often of little help in shaping a debate topic.

Fortunately, many of these pitfalls can be overcome by offering a qualitative definition of “substantially.” Black’s Law Dictionary, for example, defines substantial as “without material qualification.” Under this definition, affirmative plans would have to defend a blanket increase in transportation infrastructure investment. For example, the affirmative might increase funding for all infrastructure investments that exist now. These policies do not “materially qualify” their increase in investment, which means they do not restrict themselves to only a certain, small sub-section of transport. If your affirmative uses a material qualification, you might respond to this argument by pointing out the benefits for affirmative ground and fair debate of allowing affirmatives to materially qualify.

**Increase**

Increase is fairly straightforward. A common definition might be “make greater” and just serves to set the direction of the topic as increasing investment as opposed to decreasing it. Crafy negatives, however, will likely interpret the word increase to mean more than this. For example, can the affirmative topically have the US government give incentives to private corporations to build transportation infrastructure, or does the government need to be involved? Does increasing investment require the affirmative to add on to existing programs, or does it allow them to create a completely new program? Does an “increase” need to be immediate, or could the affirmative plan be accomplished through phased incentives? These questions will all be up for debate.

**Its**

Its is a possessive which connects with “The United States federal government.” It serves to limit the topic to a discussion of US transportation policy, as opposed to international or private efforts. For example, Europe has a large high-speed rail network. The affirmative can only topically increase infrastructure investment done by the US government, not other actors. This also opens up possible counterplan ground for some affirmatives on the topic, to increase investment using another agent.

**Transportation Infrastructure Investment**

This phrase is the crux of the whole topic. It provides the primary limiting phrase that defines the parameters of the resolution. In brief, this phrase directs the affirmative to have the federal government boost its expenditures on improving and/or expanding US roads, highways, bridges, ports, airports, and the like. It is helpful to consider these three words both as a phrase, and then taken together separately. Most useful for debate purposes will likely be defining it as a phrase. Since transportation infrastructure has been an ongoing issue in Congress over the last year, as part of Obama’s stimulus plans, there will be lots of contextual definitions which speak to what kinds of programs should be topical. While these definitions may not be exhaustive, they should help give a picture of what types of plans would fit under the resolution.

To be more specific about what this phrase entails, it helps to examine each individual word as well. Transportation is used as an adjective in this phrase to specify the type of infrastructure the affirmative should invest in. In this context, transportation includes infrastructure which is used as a conveyance for goods, people, or both. This includes obvious things like roads, highways, bridges, tunnels, mass transit (such as rail and buses), canals, airports, etc…It may also include other components to this infrastructure, such as sea ports, electrical systems, facilities that support other components of the infrastructure, and even things as speculative as space transportation. Primarily, the word transportation serves to limit out affirmatives which invest in other forms of critical infrastructure – such as the power grid, sewers, etc…

“Infrastructure” is generally taken to mean the base or foundation of something. In the context of transportation, that usually means the physical installations, facilities, and services that support the movement (transport) of goods and people. The exact parameters of that are still up for debate – should infrastructure include supporting components, such as the administrative structures that manage the roads? How about power lines necessary to power high speed rail?

Investment is also a difficult term to define precisely. In the broadest sense, investment means the government putting resources (money, human resources, federal attention) into the expansion, maintenance, repair, or improvements of transportation infrastructure. Exactly what form this investment can take is an open question – while directly funding projects is the most obvious way, there will be debate over whether the USFG can give money to third parties, such as the states or private industry, and allow them to direct the investments. Does an investment require an up-front payment, or can it be done in the form of incentives, such as tax breaks? Definitions will differ on what precisely this means.

**In the United States**

This phrase serves to limit the scope of the topic to investments which take place in the territorial boundaries of the US. This precludes, for example, the USFG spending money on infrastructure projects in other nations and claiming advantages related to development. The word “in” is generally taken to mean “within” – that is, inside the boundaries of the US. Since the topic also specifies “its” – this means the scope of the topic is limited domestically. It also means that there is some ground opened up for the negative to read counterplans which do investments outside the United States. While these counterplans would be unlikely to solve domestic-only advantages, they might be able to remedy advantages related to US competitiveness, or just the existence of infrastructure such as a space elevator.

**Conclusion**

This analysis of the 2012-2013 Transportation topic has aimed to help you prepare for a wide range of debates. This topic provides a wide degree of affirmative flexibility in choosing how and where to increase transportation investment, which will allow the affirmative to be creative both in their plan mechanism and in their advantages in order to keep negative teams guessing. At the same time, this will allow negative teams to craft solid, in-depth responses to most typical “genres” of affirmative plans, and allow them to write generic arguments which apply to any type of aff. Finally, you should use this resolution analysis to begin thinking about which cases are and are not topical. Focus on the key terms in the resolution that allow for the most debate. What is the distinction between a policy that only increases investment, and one that takes other actions (such as boosting private investment)? Should affirmatives be forced to increase funding for all transportation infrastructure, or can affirmatives pick and choose which subset of infrastructure to focus on? These are some of the key questions that will come up in topicality debates throughout the 2012-2013 season.

### Potential Affirmative Cases

Aaron Hardy and Jim Hanson, Whitman College

Below is a short list and description for potential cases on this year’s topic. Included in the discussion of these affirmative cases is a short explanation of the current problems and issues and potential plan mechanisms that could be utilized to solve these problems.

**Common Advantage Areas**

Keep in mind that many affirmatives on this topic will be able to access the same basic advantage ground. The fundamental area of debate on this topic is whether the US should increase investment in transportation infrastructure. All the various types of harms which arise due to a poor US infrastructure are potential affirmative advantages. While each affirmative will have a different plan mechanism or unique reason for their particular transportation program, most affirmatives have at least the potential to claim one of a few set of “core” advantages.

Foremost is the generic Competitiveness advantage. This advantage says that the United States is rapidly falling behind other countries in economic competitiveness, and especially in the area of transportation investments. The affirmative will says that transportation infrastructure is the key underlying basis for the future of the economy – without the ability to efficiently move people and goods, the US economy will be hampered. This advantage claims that other countries, such as China, are making massive investments in a modern transport infrastructure, and that a failure to keep pace will undermine the whole economy and US global leadership. This will undercut US hegemony, and cause the breakdown of global order. Any affirmative which does large scale investment into the US transportation infrastructure can likely claim this as an advantage

Another generic advantage is Stimulus. The US economy remains on relatively weak footing, and there are many economists who think that the only way to avert a coming “double dip” recession is for the government to enact additional fiscal stimulus measures in the form of public works projects. This is proffered as one of the primary justification for Obama’s “jobs” agenda. The content of the stimulus itself is usually thought to matter somewhat less than the fact that large sums of money are being spent - and –he affirmative will point at Obama’s 2008 stimulus measures as the reason why the US economy isn’t worse off than it already is. Any affirmative which spends a lot of money would be able to claim this as an advantage.

A last advantage held in common by many affirmatives is the environment. The US transportation infrastructure is largely old and lacks modern upgrades. This results in a lot of inefficiency. It is also very “car centric” – encouraging people to drive and use a lot of fossil fuels. An affirmative which either modernizes the infrastructure to be less energy intensive and more sustainable, or which built a new system of public transportation that reduced Americans reliance on automobiles could claim that they reduced fossil fuel use and the impact of transportation infrastructure on the environment.

**Highways**

One of the most commonly discussed infrastructure projects in the US is to invest in improving roads and highways. Many commentators see the Interstate Highway Systems (or IHS) as in desperate need of improvement and modernization. Given a lack of federal funding, many roads around the country are literally falling apart, and most states lack the money to fix them. Affirmatives could approach this in a variety of ways, but most plans would give money or resources to help improve the whole system. They would then claim advantages related to competitiveness and the economy.

Another affirmative advantage area related to highways is the military. Some authors say that a reliable highway system is key to the ability of the US military to rapidly move troops and equipment in a responsive way during a crisis. The affirmative could then say that our current infrastructure would fail to successfully enable military readiness. This might undermine the efficacy of our armed forces and damage US hegemony.

**High Speed Rail**

Besides highways, one of the most frequently discussed transportation projects in the US is High Speed Rail or HSR. Countries like Europe and Japan have been relying on high speed “bullet” trains for decades, which move millions of people and arguably reduce congestion on highways and the amount of fossil fuels burned in automobiles. They are also much faster than driving a car – sometimes traveling at over 200mph. While there have been some federal plans in recent years to build and expand high-speed rail lines in the US, they have largely stalled or remained on the drawing board.

An affirmative could invest in the development or expansion of HSR in the United States. They could then claim advantages about keeping up with HSR developments in other countries, advantages about competitiveness, and claim that it is the best form of public transport to help offset car usage. Since there are many advocates for HSR in the literature, this is likely to be a popular affirmative.

**Port Security**

After September 11, there has been an increased focus across the board on homeland security. Despite this, many analysts say the US remains woefully unprepared for a possible terrorist attack on the United States, and isolate US maritime ports as one of the most likely targets for infiltration. Given the sheer quantity of cargo that comes into the United States every day, it is a very difficult task to try and screen or evaluate all of it for potential threats. Some think this represents a serious hole in our homeland defense, and may allow a terrorist to smuggle a weapon of mass destruction with ease

Affirmatives may try and deal with this problem by investing additional money and resources into improving port security. This may take the form of more high technology, such as scanners and radiation detectors, modernizing the port infrastructure to speed legitimate cargo, or hiring additional personnel to enable better screening of potential threats.

**Space**

One potentially high-flown idea is for affirmatives to build a “space elevator” to enable cheaper access to outer space. A space elevator is a proposal to build a platform in space connected to a long “elevator cable” which connects to the surface of the earth, and enables elevator-like cars to slowly ascend into orbit. This removes the need to launch expensive rockets, and might lower costs sufficiently to enable a whole host of space-related projects, from colonization to space solar power. An affirmative may choose to build an elevator as rapidly as possible, and claim space advantages, much like last year’s Space topic.

There are also many other potential affirmatives in the “Space” section of the topic. For example, the United States could invest in a series of “space ports” which enabled high-tech aircraft to fly to space, or the expansion of space tourism. They could also try and build a system of supporting infrastructure in the United States to make rocket launches easier. One thing affirmatives will have to be aware of is the risks of an “in the United States” topicality violation, and will have to gear their plan to meet this violation.

**Sustainability**

One frequent complaint about the US transportation infrastructure is that it is not designed with sustainability in mind. Since it was largely constructed decades ago, significant advances in technology and building techniques have been made which allow more environmentally friendly transportation and construction. An affirmative could make investments in this area and make the US transportation infrastructure more “green” – and then claim advantages about environmental destruction, global warming, and the like.

**Airports**

As anyone who has ever tried to travel by air during a busy holiday can attest, the US airport system is frequently strained to deal with existing demand for air travel. Some heavily traveled routes (such as Los Angeles to San Francisco) are clogged even for available airspace to put planes in. Failure to update and expand our infrastructure of airports may limit US economic growth, hurt our competitiveness in global trade, and limit passenger mobility around the country.

**Other infrastructure projects**

There are as many other varied affirmatives on this topic as there are components to the US transportation infrastructure. An affirmative could choose to deal with any piece of this larger puzzle. For example, an affirmative could choose to focus entirely on bridges. Many bridges in the US are essentially falling apart, and are considered unsafe or close to unsafe for continued transportation. This may have significant effects on the US economy, and could cause major accidents if left unaddressed.

Affirmatives could also run cases about “navigable waterways” which seek to modernize or improve the transportation of goods from the ocean in-land (or vice versa) through canals, locks, or large rivers such as the Mississippi or Ohio. This infrastructure may be critical to the US competing in global maritime trade.

Affs could also focus on even smaller aspects of the transportation infrastructure – such as pedestrian walkways, bike paths, or even sidewalk curbs. While advantages to these affirmatives are likely to be narrow (or critical in nature), they may still attract affirmatives who want to run cases in the “corner” of the topic. Improving these aspects of the US transportation infrastructure could have effects on urban livability, inter-class or interracial interactions, and the like.

This list is certainly not exhaustive – there will be many takes on how to increase investment in transportation infrastructure. More importantly, there are many different policy suggestions from both sides of the political spectrum for what US transportation policy should be – and all of these will be accessed at some point by affirmative teams. Make sure to do your own research to explore likely directions the affirmative might take.

## Transportation Advantage Core

### Uniqueness – Competitiveness Low Now

#### US competitiveness will continue to decline.

Adam Hersh and Christian Weller, Economist at the Center for American Progress and associate professor of public policy at the University of Massachusetts–Boston, 5/18/2012, “Making Investments Today for a Competitive Economy Tomorrow,” http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/05/may\_productivity\_snapshot.html

Productivity growth—the rate at which we increase production for a given amount of work and resources—is at the heart of economic growth, competitiveness, and sustained improvements in living standards for working Americans. Policy efforts were made to end the Great Recession of 2007–2009 and restore many dimensions of U.S. economic vitality, but a number of long-term trends still raise concerns about future economic competitiveness. And with slowing global economic growth, high oil prices, and resistance from conservatives in Congress and state governments to invest in America’s education, science, and infrastructure, risks for U.S. competitiveness may be rising.

#### Competitiveness low now – new studies prove.

Clyde Prestowitz, founder and President of the Economic Strategy Institute, 1/19/2012, “Fiddling while America burns,” Foreign Policy, http://prestowitz.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/01/19/fiddling\_while\_america\_burns

The United States is losing its long standing global technological leadership and is suffering a dramatic loss of competitiveness that is undermining both American living standards and American security. That's the message of three just-released studies. The National Science Board (NSB - the policy making body of the National Science Foundation) earlier this week published the results of an analysis showing that over the past decade the United States has lost more than a quarter of its high tech jobs as its once vaunted global leadership in science and technology evaporates at an ever accelerating rate. According to the NSB, the U.S. share of global research and development dropped between 1999 and 2009 from 38 to 31 percent while that of Asia climbed from 24 to 35 percent. Yesterday, the Harvard Business School (HBS) released a presentation entitled: Prosperity at Risk. It is the results of a survey of 10,000 HBS alumni from a wide range of industries, localities, and job responsibilities. The results show that 71 percent of those surveyed believe U.S. competitiveness will continue to decline over the next three years, putting continuing downward pressure on American living standards. They also believe that U.S. corporations will be much less able to compete and to pay high wages and benefits over the next three years. Also yesterday, the U.S. Business and Industrial Council (USBIC) published a report showing that the foreign produced share of U.S. high valued added manufacturing consumption hit 38 percent in 2010. The significance of this number is enormous because the mantra of U.S. economists and policy makers for the past thirty years has been that America and American workers are moving to the "higher ground" of advanced technology and high value added production as the manufacture of commodities and lower value added products moves abroad to take advantage of inexpensive labor. But, as the USBIC study indicates, the high value added and advanced tech stuff seems to be moving off-shore as well, and instead of moving to higher ground, American workers are actually moving to lower ground.

### Uniqueness – Competitiveness Low Now

#### US comparative decline inevitable.

Niall Ferguson, Laurence A. Tisch Professor of History, Harvard University, 3/28/2012, “Is the US Losing Competitiveness?” Testimony for the Commerce, Justice, Science Appropriations Subcommittee, http://appropriations.house.gov/UploadedFiles/03.28.12\_CJS\_-\_American\_Manufacturing\_and\_Job\_Repatriation\_-\_Niall\_Ferguson\_-\_Testimony.pdf

In just four year’s time, according to the International Monetary Fund, the U.S. economy is likely to be overtaken by China’s, if gross domestic product (GDP) is calculated on the basis of purchasing power parity. For first time since the 1880s, the United States will no longer have the world’s largest economy. Nor is that the only sign that the U.S. economy is suffering relative decline. The U.S. stock market was heavily outperformed by most emerging markets over the past ten years. The average annual return for American stocks was 0.5% between 2001 and 2011, compared with 11.4% for emerging market stocks. For ordinary Americans, as well as for international investors, the past decade has been deeply disappointing. Between 1999 and 2007 – the year when the financial crisis began – median household income fell in real terms. It has fallen further since then. According to the National Bureau of Economic Research, the recession caused by the financial crisis ended two years ago, but the economy still needs to create an additional 7 million jobs to get back to pre-recession levels, plus another 5 million to match the continued growth in the labor force. This, despite massive levels of monetary and fiscal stimulus that have, respectively, trebled the size of the Fed’s balance sheet and nearly doubled the ration of federal debt to GDP.

### Uniqueness – AT: Resiliency

#### Current decline not short-term – structural problems undermining competitiveness.

Michael E. Porter and Jan W. Rivkin, Professors of Business Administration at Harvard Business School, March 2012, “The Looming Challenge to U.S. Competitiveness,” Harvard Business Review, http://hbr.org/2012/03/the-looming-challenge-to-us-competitiveness/ar/1

It would be easy to blame America’s current economic challenges on the severe cyclical downturn we have experienced. Economic policy could then focus solely on measures to spur recovery, as it has, overwhelmingly, in the last three years. To support the interpretation that America’s problems are cyclical, not structural, one could point to the facts that labor productivity has held up in America and corporate profits hit record highs in 2010. Unfortunately, that snapshot masks deeper signs of an incipient competitiveness problem—one that began before the Great Recession and in some ways contributed to it. The problem shows up in a range of economic performance measures as well as in the trajectories of the underlying factors that drive competitiveness.

#### Resilience not inevitable – lack of short-term improvements could trigger long-term decline.

Arvind Kaushal, Thomas Mayor and Patricia Riedl, partner, senior executive advisor and principal with Booz & Company, Autumn 2011, “Manufacturing’s Wake-up Call,” Strategy+Business, http://www.strategy-business.com/media/file/sb64\_11306.pdf

Both the optimists and the pessimists are partially correct. U.S. manufacturing is at a moment of truth. Currently, U.S. factories competitively produce about 75 percent of the products that the nation consumes. A series of identifiable smart actions and choices by business leaders, educators, and policymakers could lead to a robust, manufacturing-driven economic future and push that figure up to 95 percent. Alternatively, if the U.S. manufacturing sector remains neglected, its output could fall by half, meeting less than 40 percent of the nation’s demand, and U.S. manufacturing capabilities could then erode past the point of no return.

#### Improving infrastructure is key to resiliency.

Daniel Gross, columnist and economics editor for Yahoo! Finance, 5/10/2012, “The Myth of American Decline,” HBR Ideacast interview, http://blogs.hbr.org/ideacast/2012/05/the-myth-of-american-decline.html

I worry about infrastructure. There is no case I can think of where having poorer roads and tunnels and bridges is good for you economically. And there's this kind of willful decisions not to invest, so that's problematic. And certainly worry about politics. But those things are all choices, right. We can choose to have a different policy about infrastructure. We can choose to have a different policy about health insurance. We actually just did. The declinists are saying, these forces that are arrayed against us out there in the world are so powerful, we're impotent to deal with them in any way, shape, or form. And I think when you look at our figures on exports, when you look at how US companies engage overseas, when you look at how people around the world, when they get more means they come to the US to spend it. Or they spend money in their home market on things that we're making. It's not necessarily a zero-sum game.

### Solvency – AT: Decline Inevitable

#### Decline in competitiveness not inevitable – policy changes can solve.

Michael E. Porter and Jan W. Rivkin, Professors of Business Administration at Harvard Business School, March 2012, “The Looming Challenge to U.S. Competitiveness,” Harvard Business Review, http://hbr.org/2012/03/the-looming-challenge-to-us-competitiveness/ar/1

During the past year, we have examined U.S. competitiveness with the help of a diverse group of scholars, business leaders from around the world, and the first-ever comprehensive survey of Harvard Business School alumni. Our research suggests that the U.S. faces serious challenges. Too often, America’s leaders, in government and business, have acted in ways that neutralize the country’s many strengths. However, the decline of U.S. competitiveness is far from inevitable. The United States remains the world’s most productive large economy and its largest market for sophisticated goods and services, which stimulates innovation and acts as a magnet for investment.

#### No inevitable decline– US has core strengths to build on.

Michael E. Porter and Jan W. Rivkin, Professors of Business Administration at Harvard Business School, March 2012, “The Looming Challenge to U.S. Competitiveness,” Harvard Business Review, http://hbr.org/2012/03/the-looming-challenge-to-us-competitiveness/ar/1

We have painted an ominous picture of U.S. competitiveness. Yet we remain fundamentally optimistic about America’s economic future because the United States retains profound strengths that are very difficult to replicate. America’s system of higher education and its entrepreneurial community continue to be the world’s most powerful engine of innovation, on which productivity growth ultimately depends. The U.S. has an open, democratic society and a system of rewarding merit that attract much of the world’s best talent. America’s sophisticated markets and institutions foster intense rivalry, spurring companies to discover new routes to productivity. America’s firms are among the most ably managed in the world, and its capital markets remain the most vibrant despite the financial crisis. American society is more prone, without sentiment, to let more productive firms and institutions drive out less productive ones, making the economy as a whole remarkably dynamic and resilient. In many ways, the core of the U.S. economy remains strong. None of the dynamics we have described are inevitable. Nor are they dictated by unstoppable forces of nature or demographic trends. Rather, America’s situation is the result of choices, and lack of choices, by policy makers and managers. The steps to reverse the loss of competitiveness are feasible, though they will require a new focus on facing reality and acting in the common interest.

#### Huge potential for American competitiveness – new sources of growth.

James Manyika et al, Director of the McKinsey Global Institute, February 2011, “Growth and renewal in the United States: Retooling America's economic engine,” http://www.mckinsey.com/Insights/MGI/Research/Productivity\_Competitiveness\_and\_Growth/Growth\_and\_renewal\_in\_the\_US

There is large untapped potential to increase productivity and growth in the United States, MGI finds. Businesses can achieve three-quarters of the necessary productivity growth acceleration in the current regulatory and business environment. Companies can achieve one-quarter of the acceleration by more widely adopting best practice. Even in such sectors as retail, where US businesses have a strong productivity record, there is scope to do more (e.g., by taking lean practices from the stockroom to the storefront). Aerospace companies may be leading global exporters but they have yet to adopt lean practices in the systematic way seen among best-in-class automotive players. The public sector and regulated sectors such as healthcare, which have not faced as strong competitive pressure, offer another large opportunity. Healthcare players have just begun to adopt lean. Hospitals have room to improve how nurses spend their time—at some hospitals, nurses spend less than 40 percent of their time with patients—and to improve their discharge and admissions processes.

### Competitiveness Impact – War and Stability

#### Collapse of US economic leadership causes global conflict and nuclear escalation.

Aaron Friedberg and Gabriel Schoenfeld, professor of politics and international relations at Princeton’s Woodrow Wilson School and visiting scholar at the Witherspoon Institute, 10/21/2008, “The Dangers of a Diminished America ,” Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122455074012352571.html

Then there are the dolorous consequences of a potential collapse of the world's financial architecture. For decades now, Americans have enjoyed the advantages of being at the center of that system. The worldwide use of the dollar, and the stability of our economy, among other things, made it easier for us to run huge budget deficits, as we counted on foreigners to pick up the tab by buying dollar-denominated assets as a safe haven. Will this be possible in the future? Meanwhile, traditional foreign-policy challenges are multiplying. The threat from al Qaeda and Islamic terrorist affiliates has not been extinguished. Iran and North Korea are continuing on their bellicose paths, while Pakistan and Afghanistan are progressing smartly down the road to chaos. Russia's new militancy and China's seemingly relentless rise also give cause for concern. If America now tries to pull back from the world stage, it will leave a dangerous power vacuum. The stabilizing effects of our presence in Asia, our continuing commitment to Europe, and our position as defender of last resort for Middle East energy sources and supply lines could all be placed at risk. In such a scenario there are shades of the 1930s, when global trade and finance ground nearly to a halt, the peaceful democracies failed to cooperate, and aggressive powers led by the remorseless fanatics who rose up on the crest of economic disaster exploited their divisions. Today we run the risk that rogue states may choose to become ever more reckless with their nuclear toys, just at our moment of maximum vulnerability.

#### Sustaining US economic leadership key to the global stability.

Kati Suominen, Resident Fellow in Economics at the German Marshall Fund, 2012, Peerless and Periled, p.14

The durability of the American order reflects its merits and the absence of alternatives. The American order is designed to advance growth and globalization and safeguard global stability. It is a coherent institutional and intellectual framework—one of rules-based institutions premised on free markets and good governance. It is a liberal order rooted not on notions of international anarchy or the failed experiment of history—coercion—but on open markets, private property, and, when those are met, democracy. It is not an order imposed, but an order adopted. It has prospered because of its built-in promise of mutual economic gains to its adherents—gains unattainable by other means. That practically all countries have joined it in the past six decades is a testimony to its exceptionalism.

#### US competitiveness key to crisis de-escalation and global stability.

Ashley J. Tellis, Senior Associate, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2010, Power shift: How the West can Adapt and Thrive in an Asian Century, http://www.gmfus.org/galleries/pdf/GMFPower20Shift20Asia20Paper\_for\_web200128.pdf

The emerging Asian century undoubtedly represents a great opportunity for sustaining global prosperity. Yet because this era will be fundamentally different from the first iteration of the Asian miracle, in that allies and competitors are now inextricably entwined in a dense web of transactions which increase absolute gains but unevenly, the United States and its partners face many more challenges in maintaining a stable geopolitical order. In such circumstances, the most effective strategy for Washington, as the leader of the transatlantic community, is not to retrench from its commitment to expanding the open economic system, but to maintain in good repair its own national power and its constituent military prowess in order to mitigate any tensions that may arise either regionally or globally between economic gains and international security.

### Competitiveness Impact – Global Economy

#### Boosting US competitiveness key to sustainable global economic growth.

Kati Suominen, Resident Fellow in Economics at the German Marshall Fund, 2012, Peerless and Periled, pp.2-3

The outcome reflects a fact of global governance: there are no rival orders that would match the growth and globalization produced by the American order. But while the American order is peerless, it is also periled. Financial instability has become more frequent, fatal, and global over the past decades, but the institutions of the American order are failing to confront it. At the same time, as the core of the order, the United States is ailing at home and failing to lead abroad. Even as reformed, the American order remains defenseless. This is the Achilles heel of the American order and one that jeopardizes its existence: a defective order will cease to garner support from the adherent nations. A downfall of the American order would pull down growth and globalization in its wake, spelling disaster for all nations. Reforms and leadership are required, but divisive power politics among nations and self-defeating Washington bickering stand in the way. This book is a road map through them. A thriving twenty-first-century world economy is within reach, but America must reach harder than ever for it.

#### Decline in US competitiveness destroys the global economy.

Michael E. Porter and Jan W. Rivkin, Professors of Business Administration at Harvard Business School, March 2012, “The Looming Challenge to U.S. Competitiveness,” Harvard Business Review, http://hbr.org/2012/03/the-looming-challenge-to-us-competitiveness/ar/1

Competitiveness is not a zero-sum game, in which one country can advance only if others lose. Long-term productivity—and, along with it, living standards—can improve in many countries. Global competition is not a fight for a fixed pool of demand; huge needs for improving living standards are waiting to be met around the world. Productivity improvements in one country create new demand for goods and services that firms in other countries can pursue. Greater productivity in, say, India can lead to higher wages and profits there, boosting demand for pharmaceuticals from New Jersey and software from Silicon Valley. Spreading innovation and productivity improvement allows global prosperity to grow. Because the global economy is not a zero-sum game, the decline of American competitiveness is a problem not only for the U.S. The global economy will be diminished if its largest national economy is weak, ceases to be an engine of innovation, and loses its influence in shaping a fair and open global trading system.

#### US competitiveness key to global economic growth.

Nitin Nohria, Harvard Business School Dean, 2/16/2012, “Why US Competitiveness Matters,” http://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/6958.html

The Chinese care about China, of course, but they are rooting for America as well. Indeed, the Brazilians, the Indians, and the majority of others I have met outside the US are also rallying for us. They understand that the world is interdependent and that the US economy is still too large for anyone to profit from a rapid decline in its well-being. Americans may not realize this, but it's true: The world wants us to be competitive. Recently, though, I've begun to get the sense that our friends abroad cheer for America with foreboding and pessimism, the way sports fans nervously pull for a team whose lead is slimming and whose energy is fading. These outsiders recognize that the system of democratic capitalism that produced centuries of American prosperity is troubled.

### Competitiveness Impact – Global Trade

#### US competitiveness key to sustain global free trade regime.

Ashley J. Tellis, Senior Associate, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2010, Power shift: How the West can Adapt and Thrive in an Asian Century, http://www.gmfus.org/galleries/pdf/GMFPower20Shift20Asia20Paper\_for\_web200128.pdf

Third, the United States in particular must strengthen its national economy if it wishes to thrive in the coming Asian century. This is true of its democratic partners as well. Simply stated, the success of the current wave of globalization, like the one that preceded it in the 19th century, is owed fundamentally to the existence of a hegemonic power. Since the end of the Second World War, American preponderance has underwritten many of the key components—from the dollar as a global reserve currency to the rules of the international order to the defense of the commons—which have made a successful open trading system possible. Should the American economy weaken inexorably over time, there is every likelihood that the current successful phase of globalization, although often assumed to be a permanent reality, could atrophy and eventually collapse. Mercifully, such dangers are neither immediate nor inevitable because the U.S. economy, whatever its current troubles, is not enervated by any terminal illness.

#### Increasing US relative position key to address new trade challenges.

Leslie Gelb, president emeritus of the Council on Foreign Relations, Summer 2010, “Fashioning a

Realistic Strategy for the Twenty-First Century,” Fletcher Forum of World Affairs, http://ui04e.moit.tufts.edu/forum/archives/pdfs/34-2pdfs/Gelb.pdf

Well, I think we know what the challenges are. There are international economic challenges in trade and foreign investment, particularly with China as the Chinese write their investment laws and open up their country to competition. Of course, we know that there are climate change problems, and the problems with international terrorism. These are all very serious, but we will be in a much better position to deal with them when our economy is stronger. And that is the main way to be taken seriously.

#### Competitiveness key to global free markets and crisis resolution.

Iwan Morgan, Professor of United States Studies, Institute of the Americas, University College London, 2011,“The American Economy and America’s Global Power,” United States after Unipolarity, http://www2.lse.ac.uk/IDEAS/publications/reports/pdf/SR009/morgan.pdf

America’s economic strength has long underwritten its leading role in world affairs. The buoyant tax revenues generated by economic growth fund its massive military spending, the foundation of its global hard power. America’s economic success is also fundamental to its soft power and the promotion of its free-market values in the international economy. Finally, prosperity generally makes the American public more willing to support an expansive foreign policy on the world stage, whereas economic problems tend to engender popular introspection. Ronald Reagan understood that a healthy economy was a prerequisite for American power when he became president amid conditions of runaway inflation and recession. As he put it in his memoirs, ‘In 1981, no problem the country faced was more serious than the economic crisis – not even the need to modernise our armed forces – because without a recovery, we couldn’t afford to do the things necessary to make the country strong again or make a serious effort to reduce the dangers of nuclear war. Nor could America regain confidence in itself and stand tall once again. Nothing was possible unless we made the economy sound again’.

### Competitiveness Impact – Global Leadership

#### Declines in relative economic strength destroy US global leadership.

Robert Kappel, president of the German Institute of Global and Area Studies and a professor at the universities of Hamburg and Leipzig, 2011, “The Decline of Europe and the US: Shifts in the World Economy and in Global Politics,” GIGA Focus, http://www.giga-hamburg.de/dl/download.php?d=/content/publikationen/pdf/gf\_international\_1101.pdf

Despite the vehemence applied by American politicians to the defence of the United States’ imperial (to some extent) behaviour and the affirmation of the nation’s leadership role, it is apparent that the United States has lost its status as a hegemon. Joseph Nye claims that the US is experiencing a relative decline, not an absolute decline. Even though the US clearly constitutes the world’s strongest economic and military power, it is nevertheless struggling with severe weaknesses resulting from low economic growth and the prolonged decline of the processing industry (25% of GNP 40 years ago, now 12%) – particularly in the field of innovative technological products. Additionally, gross investment has declined and technological progress has stagnated due to low educational standards. Industrial productivity and the increase of total factor productivity, which indicate technological progress, are growing far too sluggishly to maintain an internationally competitive leading position. The US’s distinct loss of momentum has been going on for years, leading to an overall decline in driving economic force and appeal, and resulting in a loss of global acceptance. Surveys and regression analyses have shown that the size of the population, industrial value added and the ability to export are central criteria for leading powers, including the US. In recent years, the significance of the US has been marked by a decrease in these fields. However, of far greater importance is that the size of the military is no longer all-decisive: In an article in Foreign Affairs, former President of the Council on Foreign Relations Leslie Gelb emphasises precisely this aspect. The development of the economy is more important than military strength. Countries unable to generate economic growth that become technologically weaker are thus less able to adequately meet global economic challenges, resulting ultimately in the loss of political and economic leadership. Gelb maintains that this is becoming apparent in the case of the US.

#### Economic leadership is the biggest internal link – outweighs military force.

Leslie H. Gelb, President Emeritus of the Council on Foreign Relations, November/December 2010, “GDP Now Matters More Than Force,” Foreign Affairs, p.3

Most nations today beat their foreign policy drums largely to economic rhythms, but less so the United States. Most nations define their interests largely in economic terms and deal mostly in economic power, but less so the United States. Washington still thinks of its security mainly in traditional military terms and responds to threats mainly with force. The principal challenge for Washington, then, is to recompose its foreign policy with an economic theme, while countering threats in new and creative ways. The goal is to redefine “security” to harmonize with twenty-first-century realities. Economics is now the principal coin of the international realm, and gross domestic product now matters more than military might. Any doubts about that should be erased by one simple and overwhelming fact: China is the first global power in world history that is not a global military power. China’s military punch will be restricted to its border areas for years. Most nations worry not about Chinese arms, but about its trade and investment decisions. And though China’s GDP is just a little more than half of America’s, Beijing’s power rivals Washington’s. World leaders see China’s economy going up and America’s going down, largely because of Washington’s political incapacity to make hard decisions about its domestic economy.

### Competitiveness Impact – Global Leadership

#### US competitiveness key to leadership – both will collapse now.

Alfred W. McCoy, Professor of History at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, 12/6/2010, “The Decline and Fall of the American Empire,” The Nation, http://www.thenation.com/article/156851/decline-and-fall-american-empire

Significantly, in 2008, the US National Intelligence Council admitted for the first time that America's global power was indeed on a declining trajectory. In one of its periodic futuristic reports, Global Trends 2025, the Council cited “the transfer of global wealth and economic power now under way, roughly from West to East" and "without precedent in modern history,” as the primary factor in the decline of the “United States' relative strength—even in the military realm.” Like many in Washington, however, the Council’s analysts anticipated a very long, very soft landing for American global preeminence, and harbored the hope that somehow the US would long “retain unique military capabilities… to project military power globally” for decades to come. No such luck. Under current projections, the United States will find itself in second place behind China (already the world's second largest economy) in economic output around 2026, and behind India by 2050. Similarly, Chinese innovation is on a trajectory toward world leadership in applied science and military technology sometime between 2020 and 2030, just as America's current supply of brilliant scientists and engineers retires, without adequate replacement by an ill-educated younger generation.

### Competitiveness Impact – Military Power

#### Competitiveness is the larger internal link to hegemony – key to military strength.

Michael Beckley, research fellow in the International Security Program at Harvard Kennedy School’s

Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Winter 2011/2012, “China’s Century? Why America’s Edge Will Endure,” International Security, http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Chinas\_Century.pdf

The key point is that national power is multifaceted and cannot be measured with a single or a handful of metrics. In the analyses that follow, I allot more space to economic indicators than to military indicators. This is not because economic power is necessarily more important than military power, but rather because most declinist writings argue that the United States is in economic, not military, decline. Moreover, military power is ultimately based on economic strength. International relations scholars tend to view civilian and military realms as separate entities, but militaries are embedded within economic systems. In a separate study, I show that countries that excel in producing commercial products and innovations also tend to excel in producing military force. Part of this advantage stems from greater surplus wealth, which allows rich states to sustain large military investments. Economically developed states, however, also derive military benefits from their technological infrastructures, efficient production capacities, advanced data analysis networks, stocks of managerial expertise, and stable political environments. In short, economic indicators are, to a significant degree, measures of military capability. Focusing on the former, therefore, does not imply ignoring the latter.

#### Studies prove – military power is the most important variable for military leadership.

Michael Beckley, Department of Political Science, Columbia University, February 2010, “Economic Development and Military Effectiveness,” Journal of Strategic Studies, p.44

The major empirical finding of this article suggests that this is indeed the case. In hundreds of battles and wars between 1898 and 1987, states with higher levels of economic development consistently outfought less developed opponents. This is not surprising. What is surprising is that many of the political and social factors posited to affect military capability either seem to be irrelevant or have the opposite effect of that found in previous studies: when economic development is taken into account, culture and human capital become insignificant and democracy actually degrades warfighting capability. In short, the conventional military dominance of Western democracies stems primarily from superior levels of economic development, not societal pathologies or political institutions.

#### Competitiveness key to hard power.

Dick K. Nanto, Coordinator, Specialist in Industry and Trade at the Congressional Research Service, 1/4/2011, “Economics and National Security: Issues and Implications for U.S. Policy,” http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/natsec/R41589.pdf

The world, however, has changed. Globalization, the rise of China, the prospect of an unsustainable debt burden, unprecedented federal budget deficits, the success of mixed economies with both state-owned and private businesses, huge imbalances in international trade and capital flows, and high unemployment have brought economics more into play in considerations of national security. Traditionally the economy has entered into the national security debate through its impact on the nation’s hard power: the funding of defense, the efficacy of the defense industrial base, and the use of economic sanctions and other instruments as nonkinetic tools of warfare. The long-term efficacy of hard power, however, depends greatly on the ability of a country to provide for it through an ever growing and innovative economy.

### Uniqueness – AT: Economy Resilient

#### US and Global economies on the brink – new trouble risks downturn.

Reuters, 4/17/2012, “World economy fragile, faces "uneasy calm:" IMF,” http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/04/17/us-imf-weo-idUSBRE83G0S520120417

Global growth is slowly improving as the U.S. recovery gains traction and dangers from Europe recede, but risks remain high and the situation is very fragile, the International Monetary Fund said on Tuesday. Another flare-up of the euro-zone sovereign debt crisis or sharp escalation in oil prices on geopolitical uncertainty could disrupt a world economy finding its feet once again after market turmoil over euro-zone budget deficits, the IMF said. "An uneasy calm remains. One has the feeling that at any moment things could well get very bad again," IMF chief economist Olivier Blanchard told reporters as he detailed the Fund's World Economic Outlook. "Our baseline forecast is for low growth in advanced countries, especially in Europe, but with downside risks being extremely present," he said.

#### Resilience arguments wrong – US economy still fragile.

Gerard Lyons, Chief Economist at Standard Chartered Bank, 2/8/2012, “Global economy: Fragile West, resilient East,” The Hindu Business Line, http://www.thehindubusinessline.com/features/investment-world/article3006756.ece

In the immediate aftermath of the financial crisis, the world economy contracted in 2009, its first fall since the Second World War. In 2010, there was a strong rebound, with the world economy growing 4.4 per cent, But in 2011, the pace of growth slowed as the policy stimulus in the West started to wear off and as more economies in Asia and Latin America raised interest rates to curb inflation. Last year, the world economy grew by three per cent. This year, the good news is that there will be growth, but it might not be any higher than it was in 2011. Europe faces further challenges. America still has a debt mountain to climb. And many emerging economies have been slowing in the early months of the year. The economic story is one of a fragile West and a resilient East.

#### US growth improving but still fragile – new setbacks will collapse the economy.

Lydia Saad, Senior Editor of the Gallup Poll, 4/11/2012, “In U.S., Economic Indicators Signal Positive Momentum,” Gallup Economy, http://www.gallup.com/poll/153851/economic-indicators-signal-positive-momentum.aspx

The rate of U.S. economic growth in the coming months could largely be determined by the pace of gains in the labor market. This may depend on increases in consumer spending, which in turn could be influenced by workers' perceptions of their job security and consumers' broader confidence in the economy. Gallup indicators touching on all four factors remain weak in absolute terms, and in many cases remain below pre-recession levels, but were at post-recession highs in March after several months of steady improvement. And the early indications from April are that, with the exception of economic confidence, these improved readings are largely holding. With consumers still fragile from the recent recession, any significant economic setback -- such as with unemployment, the stock market, or gas prices -- could cause another rapid reversal in confidence and spending. However, barring that, Gallup's economic metrics appear poised to finally make a significant break from their post-recession lows.

### I/L – US Key to the Global Economy

#### US economic decline tanks the global economy – past crises prove.

Rob Clarfeld, founder and President of Clarfeld Financial Advisors, 1/25/2012, “Decouple This!” Forbes, http://www.forbes.com/sites/robclarfeld/2012/01/25/decouple-this/

During the first few weeks of 2012, the markets are following the prevailing narrative that the U.S. economy has “decoupled” from the widely known troubles of Europe, and the somewhat less discussed prevailing risks from China. In a “decoupling” scenario, a country or region is deemed to be able to withstand the troubles going on outside of its own borders because of its own internal economic strength. I see two major problems with this thesis. First, the U.S. economy is not growing at the recently predicted robust rate of 4-5%; rather it is struggling to achieve a rate of 2-2.5%. This leaves little cushion to withstand the “contagion” from a major economic fallout from either Europe or China, or for that matter, economic shocks that have yet to surface. A significant European debt default, banking failure, natural disasters or geopolitical events, would surely impact the U.S. economy and markets beyond the current level of fragile growth – we simply don’t have the levels of productivity requisite to absorb a major blow. Second, it was only a few years ago when the decoupling thesis was widely espoused following the U.S. banking crisis and ensuing recession. At the time the thinking was that the robust growth experienced in the emerging markets would be able to withstand the U.S. slowdown and pick up some of the slack in the global economy. We now know how that worked out – it didn’t! When the U.S. went into a major recession it dragged down the rest of the world with it. We need to deal with it — the global economy remains highly interdependent. If a number of dominoes begin to fall, it is highly unlikely that any individual country or region will be able to escape the carnage. Again, any financial crisis would be occurring from levels of growth that have not yet fully recovered from their recessionary lows. In relative terms, some countries and regions will do better than others, but the “decoupling” thesis is highly flawed.

#### It’s not just about global growth - US economy key to global economic stability.

Robert Wiedemer, managing director of Absolute Investment Management, 6/29/2011, “If US Loses Economic Stability, so Will the World,” Money News, http://www.moneynews.com/RobertWiedemer/robert-wiedemer-us-economic/2011/06/29/id/401881

Although the U.S. may be less important as a driver of world economic growth than it was 20 years ago--China has obviously grown substantially and Europe has grown as well—it is absolutely the fundamental driver of world economic stability. An example of that came last week when the Fed quietly extended its lending program to European, Canadian and Japanese central banks. Under this program, central banks can get loans in dollars from the Fed to give to their nation’s commercial banks. At the peak of the financial crisis, the Fed lent out more than $600 billion to other government’s central banks under this program. The reason the Fed extended its lending program is to help commercial banks around the world to weather any storm created by Greece not passing its austerity program this week and thus triggering a default on its massive debts. The Fed is concerned, as are many investors, that such a default would trigger waves of financial problems around the world. The power to lend such vast amounts of money to other central banks is part of the reason we are the driver of world economic stability. However, the other reason is that our government debt is so massive and so widely held that it is terribly important to the world economy. Our stock market is also a bellwether and leader of other stock markets. When our market crashes, so do the world’s stock markets.

### I/L – US Key to the Global Economy

#### No decoupling – declines in US growth undermine the global economy.

Matthew O'Brien, associate editor at The Atlantic covering business and economics, 3/6/2012, “U-S-A! Why You Should Be Even More Optimistic About the Economy,” The Atlantic, http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2012/03/u-s-a-why-you-should-be-even-more-optimistic-about-the-economy/253983/

The 2000s were a golden age for economic buzzwords (and not all of them were Tom Friedman's fault). Among the more embarrassing catch-phrases not inspired by conversations with cab drivers was "decoupling." The gist was that as emerging markets like China, and even developed ones like Europe, made up a greater share of the world economy, they would rely less on the United States for their own growth. Even if the United States fell into recession, these economies would "decouple" and power through -- or so the story went. This description of an increasingly post-American world sounded plausible enough. But if the past few years have proven anything -- other than that it might be a good idea to actually regulate the shadow banking system -- it's that the United States is still the world's economically indispensable nation. The below chart from Reuters shows a survey of manufacturing activity from across the world's biggest economies since 2008. (A reading above 50 means conditions are improving, while one under 50 means they are deteriorating). Notice how Europe and China move in complete sync with the United States.

### I/L – AT: Decoupling

#### Decoupling empirically wrong – ignores exports and connected markets.

Charles Sizemore, founder and Chief Investment Officer of Dallas-based Sizemore Capital Management LLC, 2/9/2012, “Emerging markets decoupling? Not in this lifetime.” MarketWatch, http://www.marketwatch.com/story/emerging-markets-decoupling-not-in-this-lifetime-2012-02-09

Let's just say it didn't work out that way. Emerging market stocks, as measured by the iShares MSCI Emerging Markets ETF EEM -0.48% , lost over 60% of their value in the bloodletting that followed (between late '07 and early '09 ), falling harder and faster than their developed peers. There were two major flaws in the decoupling argument. First, fundamentally, most of the major emerging market economies (and most notably China) depend disproportionately on exports to the West. How, exactly, were emerging markets to continue humming along when their customers abroad weren't buying? Secondly, correlations among global equities have risen in recent decades as capital markets have become more integrated. For a host of reasons -- the rise of ETFs that bundle stocks together, the dependence on leverage that forces managers to liquidate quickly to cover losses, or that bogeyman of all bogeymen: Algorithmic trading -- formerly uncorrelated markets tend to rise and fall together now.

#### Decoupling wrong – European crisis proves.

Terrence Murray, retired former Chairman of FleetBoston Financial Corporation, 3/2/2012, “What Decoupling? BRIC Consumers Concerned by Europe’s Recessionary Dip,” The Financialist, http://www.thefinancialist.com/what-decoupling-bric-consumers-concerned-by-europes-recessionary-dip/

The impact of Europe’s sluggish economy on the spending habits of consumers in emerging markets challenges the notion that economic decoupling is giving financial independence to new economic heavyweights like the BRIC countries. Proponents of the idea of decoupling argue that fast-growing emerging markets are less dependent on US or EU GDP growth to feed their own economic engines. The impact Europe’s slowing economies are having on the spending habits of emerging markets consumers fumbles the notion of an economic decoupling splitting fast emerging economies, including BRIC countries from established, industrialized ones. Specifically, decoupling argues that fast-growing emerging markets are less dependent on US or EU GDP growth to feed their economic engines. Given that many of the fast-growing economies polled by Credit Suisse are export driven, they’re bound to feel the headwinds of the slowdown in key developed markets, the survey highlights.

#### No decoupling – shocks in one country get transmitted globally.

Donald L. Kohn, Vice Chairman of the Federal Reserve, 6/26/2008, “Global Economic Integration and Decoupling,” Speech At the International Research Forum on Monetary Policy, http://www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/kohn20080626a.htm

One result of this financial integration is that the financial channels are growing in importance in the transmission of shocks between economies. The extent of this integration has become painfully evident to investors and financial institutions during the current episode of financial turmoil, with the collapse of the subprime mortgage market in the United States spreading losses and funding pressures to many corners of the globe. Recent analysis of the size and sources of spillovers between the United States, the euro area, Japan, and other industrial countries finds a central role for international trade. But spillovers also occur through commodity prices and through financial variables such as short- and long-term interest rates and equity prices. For example, when liquidity conditions tighten in one country, globally active banks may attempt to pull liquidity from overseas affiliates, reducing the liquidity consequences at home but simultaneously transmitting the shock abroad. What is particularly interesting is that in some cases, financial linkages might now be more important for transmission than the traditional trade linkages.

### Economy Impact – Conflict

#### Lack of economic growth causes global war.

Walter Russell Mead, Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, 2/4/2009, “Only Makes You Stronger,” The New Republic, http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/2169866/posts

So far, such half-hearted experiments not only have failed to work; they have left the societies that have tried them in a progressively worse position, farther behind the front-runners as time goes by. Argentina has lost ground to Chile; Russian development has fallen farther behind that of the Baltic states and Central Europe. Frequently, the crisis has weakened the power of the merchants, industrialists, financiers, and professionals who want to develop a liberal capitalist society integrated into the world. Crisis can also strengthen the hand of religious extremists, populist radicals, or authoritarian traditionalists who are determined to resist liberal capitalist society for a variety of reasons. Meanwhile, the companies and banks based in these societies are often less established and more vulnerable to the consequences of a financial crisis than more established firms in wealthier societies. As a result, developing countries and countries where capitalism has relatively recent and shallow roots tend to suffer greater economic and political damage when crisis strikes--as, inevitably, it does. And, consequently, financial crises often reinforce rather than challenge the global distribution of power and wealth. This may be happening yet again. None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, so has war. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. Bad economic times can breed wars. Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring Adolf Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to be born? The United States may not, yet, decline, but, if we can't get the world economy back on track, we may still have to fight.

#### Economic decline causes global conflict.

Michael J Green and Steven P Schrage, Senior Advisor and Japan Chair at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) and the CSIS Scholl Chair in International Business, 3/26/2009, “It's not just the economy,” Asia Times, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Asian\_Economy/KC26Dk01.html

Facing the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression, analysts at the World Bank and the US Central Intelligence Agency are just beginning to contemplate the ramifications for international stability if there is not a recovery in the next year. For the most part, the focus has been on fragile states such as some in Eastern Europe. However, the Great Depression taught us that a downward global economic spiral can even have jarring impacts on great powers. It is no mere coincidence that the last great global economic downturn was followed by the most destructive war in human history. In the 1930s, economic desperation helped fuel autocratic regimes and protectionism in a downward economic-security death spiral that engulfed the world in conflict. This spiral was aided by the preoccupation of the United States and other leading nations with economic troubles at home and insufficient attention to working with other powers to maintain stability abroad. Today's challenges are different, yet 1933's London Economic Conference, which failed to stop the drift toward deeper depression and world war, should be a cautionary tale for leaders heading to next month's London Group of 20 (G-20) meeting. There is no question the US must urgently act to address banking issues and to restart its economy. But the lessons of the past suggest that we will also have to keep an eye on those fragile threads in the international system that could begin to unravel if the financial crisis is not reversed early in the Barack Obama administration and realize that economics and security are intertwined in most of the critical challenges we face.

### Economy Impact – Conflict

#### Studies prove recessions increase the risk of conflict.

S. Brock Blomberg and Gregory Hess, Department of Economics at Wellesley and Professor of Economics at Oberlin, February 2002, “The Temporal Links Between Conflict and Economic Activity,” Journal of Conflict Resolution, http://www.doc88.com/p-118612286522.html

Using an unbalanced panel of 152 countries from 1950 to 1992, we estimate a Markov probability model to investigate the joint determination of internal conflict, external conflict, and the economy. We begin with a simple model that allows for a two-variable relationship: internal conflict and recessions, external conflict and recessions, and internal conflict and external conflict. We find that these are not independent events. In particular, we find that recessions play an important role in determining internal conflict, especially in Africa and for nondemocratic countries. In this case, the occurrence of a recession causes an increase in the probability of internal conflict starting in a given year to almost double. We then extend the model to allow for a three-variable relationship: internal conflict, external conflict, and recessions. In the more complicated system, we continue to find an important link. In this case, we find that the presence of a recession coupled with an external war will actually cause the probability of an internal conflict starting in a given year to increase between two- and threefold. If this study is to convince readers and policy makers of anything, it is that the linkages between the internal and external conflict and prosperity are strong and mutually reinforcing. Economic conflict tends to spawn internal conflict, which in turn returns the favor. Moreover, the presence of a recession tends to amplify the extent to which internal and external conflicts self-reinforce each other. However, the ability of government organizations to stop the spread of internal conflict to external conflict and vice versa by helping to reduce the incidence of recessions may be quite limited. Economic aid that is to improve a nation’s productive capacity is likely to be difficult to identify and implement in just such circumstances.

### Economy Impact – Chinese Collapse

#### Economic decline causes Chinese nationalism and internal collapse.

Michael J Green and Steven P Schrage, Senior Advisor and Japan Chair at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) and the CSIS Scholl Chair in International Business, 3/26/2009, “It's not just the economy,” Asia Times, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Asian\_Economy/KC26Dk01.html

The greater danger with China is not an eclipsing of US leadership, but instead the kind of shift in strategic orientation that happened to Japan after the Great Depression. Japan was arguably not a revisionist power before 1932 and sought instead to converge with the global economy through open trade and adoption of the gold standard. The worldwide depression and protectionism of the 1930s devastated the newly exposed Japanese economy and contributed directly to militaristic and autarkic policies in Asia as the Japanese people reacted against what counted for globalization at the time. China today is similarly converging with the global economy, and many experts believe China needs at least 8% annual growth to sustain social stability. Realistic growth predictions for 2009 are closer to 5%. Veteran China hands were watching closely when millions of migrant workers returned to work after the Lunar New Year holiday last month to find factories closed and jobs gone. There were pockets of protests, but nationwide unrest seems unlikely this year, and Chinese leaders are working around the clock to ensure that it does not happen next year either. However, the economic slowdown has only just begun and nobody is certain how it will impact the social contract in China between the ruling communist party and the 1.3 billion Chinese who have come to see President Hu Jintao's call for "harmonious society" as inextricably linked to his promise of "peaceful development". If the Japanese example is any precedent, a sustained economic slowdown has the potential to open a dangerous path from economic nationalism to strategic revisionism in China too.

#### Lash-out causes WMD conflict.

Sam Rexing, Staff writer, 8/5/2005, “The CCP’s Last-ditch Gamble: Biological and Nuclear War

Hundreds of millions of deaths proposed,” Epoch Times, http://english.epochtimes.com/news/5-8-5/30931.html

Since the Party’s life is “above all else,” it would not be surprising if the CCP resorts to the use of biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons in its attempt to extend its life. The CCP, which disregards human life, would not hesitate to kill two hundred million Americans, along with seven or eight hundred million Chinese, to achieve its ends. These speeches let the public see the CCP for what it really is. With evil filling its every cell the CCP intends to wage a war against humankind in its desperate attempt to cling to life. That is the main theme of the speeches. This theme is murderous and utterly evil. In China we have seen beggars who coerced people to give them money by threatening to stab themselves with knives or pierce their throats with long nails. But we have never, until now, seen such a gangster who would use biological, chemical, and nuclear weapons to threaten the world, that all will die together with him. This bloody confession has confirmed the CCP’s nature: that of a monstrous murderer who has killed 80 million Chinese people and who now plans to hold one billion people hostage and gamble with their lives.

#### China won’t withstand this crisis – 2008 decoupling tactics won’t work.

Reuters Singapore, 8/3/2011, “Asia decoupling? Not minus China's help,” Indian Express, <http://www.indianexpress.com/news/asia-decoupling-not-minus-chinas-help/826566/0>

Asia's best hope for insulation against a worsening economic outlook in the United States and Europe rests on China, and it may not be willing or able to do the job. With inflation running at a three-year high, Beijing has pulled every lever at its disposal to try to brake economic growth, yet price pressures persist. That argues against a repeat of 2008, when China ramped up government spending to counter the global recession, buoying Asia and the world. As for the export linkages, China has supplanted the West as the largest trading partner for many Asian economies, but that doesn't fully protect them. Some of what China imports from its Asian neighbors goes into making other goods destined for US and European ports.

### Economy Impact – US/China War

#### Sustained US decline causes protectionism and US/China conflict.

Ian Bremmer, president of Eurasia Group, July/August 2010, “Gathering Storm: America and China in 2020,” World Affairs,” http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/article/gathering-storm-america-and-china-2020

If China and America are to coexist with a minimum of conflict in 2020, U.S. policymakers should separate the positive-sum and zero-sum elements of the relationship. Where the two sides’ interests coincide, U.S. officials should work to ensure that American economic power, political influence, and military might remain as valuable as possible for the next stage of China’s development. Resisting the temptations of protectionism won’t be easy, particularly if historically high unemployment continues to plague the U.S. economy, providing lawmakers with ample reason to scapegoat China. In Washington’s poisonous political climate, opportunists from both left and right will cast engagement with China as “appeasement.” But America cannot afford unnecessary political grandstanding on the value of China’s currency, on the trade imbalance, or on the supposed dangers of Chinese investment in U.S. assets. Sustained pressure in defense of U.S. economic interests is one thing. Protectionist posturing is another. In short, U.S. policymakers should do everything possible to cultivate mutually assured economic destruction—and to ensure that Beijing knows that a bad day for America’s economy is still a bad day for China’s.

#### US-China trade conflicts escalate to war.

Henry CK Liu, Chair – New York Private Investment Group, 8/20/2005, “The Coming Trade War Part 6,” Asia Times Online, http://atimes.com/atimes/Global\_Economy/GH20Dj01.html)

US geopolitical hostility toward China will manifest itself first in trade friction, which will lead to a mutually recriminatory trade war between the two major economies that will attract opportunistic trade realignments among the traditional allies of the United States. US multinational corporations, unable to steer US domestic politics, will increasingly trade with China through their foreign subsidiaries, leaving the US economy with even fewer jobs, and a condition that will further exacerbate anti-China popular sentiments that translate into more anti-free-trade policies generally and anti-China policies specifically. The resultant global economic depression from a trade war between the world's two largest economies will in turn heighten further mutual recriminations. An external curb from the US of Chinese export trade will accelerate a redirection of Chinese growth momentum inward, increasing Chinese power, including military power, while further encouraging anti-US sentiment in Chinese policy circles. This in turn will validate US apprehension of a China threat, increasing the prospect for armed conflict. A war between the US and China can have no winners, particularly on the political front. Even if the US were to prevail militarily through its technological superiority, the political cost of military victory would be so severe that the US as it currently exists would not be recognizable after the conflict and the original geopolitical aim behind the conflict would remain elusive, as the Vietnam War and the Iraq war have demonstrated. By comparison, the Vietnam and Iraq conflicts, destructive as they have been to the US social fabric, are mere minor scrimmages compared with a war with China. US policymakers have an option to make China a friend and partner in a peaceful world for the benefit of all nations. To do so, they must first recognize that the world can operate on the principle of plentitude and that prosperity is not something to be fought over by killing consumers in a world plagued with overcapacity.

### Economy Impact – US/China War

#### High risk of economic conflicts escalating.

Ian Bremmer, president of Eurasia Group, July/August 2010, “Gathering Storm: America and China in 2020,” World Affairs,” http://www.worldaffairsjournal.org/article/gathering-storm-america-and-china-2020

The risk of an intensifying cycle of recrimination between the two sides is increasing; such a cycle could take on a life of its own, growing beyond the ability of the two governments to contain it. To manage this risk, U.S. policymakers should find every available means over the next decade to ensure that American economic and military power remains indispensable to China’s rise, a strategy that will require considerable patience, political maturity, and more than a little good luck. But they must also enlist friends and allies to ensure that where U.S. and Chinese interests diverge, it is the latter, not the former, that ends up isolated.

### Economy Impact – Heg

#### Decline in US economic strength tanks global leadership.

Ian Bremmer, president of Eurasia Group,July/August 2011, “On the Economy, Be Careful What You Wish For,” Foreign Policy, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/06/20/on\_the\_economy\_be\_careful\_what\_you\_wish\_for

In years to come, U.S. diplomats will have to do more than jet around the world twisting arms and cutting deals. They'll have to find creative solutions to transnational problems that involve multiple players who don't necessarily accept U.S. leadership. American power has always been a mix of hard and soft forms of persuasion: a blend of liberal values, military muscle, and economic leverage. Those values endure, even if the United States itself might not always be loved in foreign capitals. It's the third element of power that is fast waning: the paramount position of the United States in a global economic order built to its advantage. For decades, American consumers have been the engine of growth around the world, and the U.S. economy remains by far the world's largest, two and a half times the size of China's. But the latest projections from the International Monetary Fund forecast that China will surpass the United States by 2016. And China is far from the only rising power on the horizon.

#### Economic decline destroys US hegemony and causes international instability.

International Relations and Security Network (ISN), 2/15/2012, “Defense Spending: Economy Trumps Strategy,” http://www.isn.ethz.ch/isn/Digital-Library/Special-Feature/Detail?lng=en&id=137230&contextid774=137230&contextid775=137227&tabid=1451616130

Accordingly, the two most recent economic crises demonstrate that all defense budgets remain malleable. In the United States and Europe, for example, neoliberal policies have tied the fate of defense spending to scarce government resources. Asia- Pacific states, on the other hand, have largely rejected the 'austerity solution' and quickly returned to increased defense spending. This, argues Klaus Olshausen, has resulted in a rising military "high tide" in East Asia and a "low tide" in Europe and the US. Both tidal movements are critical, however: the uncoordinated decrease in defense capabilities in Europe may have as destabilizing an effect on international security as a real or misperceived military build-up in Asia. (The United States' strategic relocation to the Asia Pacific region, in turn, suggests that it has a clearer idea about which tide is the more dangerous.) Whether European governments make the best of their low tide by cooperating more intensely on defense still remains to be seen, but the signs are not good. What the above trends mean for the long-term is subject to interpretation, of course. The political science literature does teach us one important lesson, though - if you want true stability in an international system, then military hegemony is good. You can argue about the nature and rightness of the hegemony, but the beneficial blanketing or smothering effect it has on systemic violence is a historical fact. Absent this type of hegemony, which the U.S. and its allies are now abandoning, the international system will feature higher degrees of risk in the coming years. And that, one can argue, is the most worrying legacy of the slash and burn approach to budget-cutting that we are now seeing in Western defense economics today.

### Economy Impact – Heg

#### Economic decline tanks US hegemony – leads to new great power wars.

Ashley J. Tellis, Senior Associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2009, Strategic Asia 2009-10: Economic Meltdown and Geopolitical Stability, pp.5-6

The current economic crisis and the character of state responses to that crisis, then, bear upon two consequential matters: first, the future of capitalism as a mode of economic organization and, second, the future of U.S. power. Both these issues are undoubtedly interlinked. If capitalism as a mode of production has been irretrievably damaged by the current economic crisis, as many appear to believe, then the material foundations of U.S. – and, more broadly, Western – power could be at considerable risk, and that in turn would have significant consequences for the future of U.S. economic and political hegemony. The potential loss of U.S. hegemony, if capitalism was in fact fundamentally weakened, will have deleterious consequences for global order. Not only will it endanger the progressive postwar globalization that raised the standard of living for millions of people worldwide, but it could presage the return to great-power competition at the core of the global system and the power-political rivalries that force states toward autarkic solutions in the realms of both economic management and national security. The current economic crisis could, therefore, have consequences that go far beyond simply the management of yet another business cycle globally. These two core issues – the impact of the global recession on the prospects for capitalism and the impact of the economic downturn in the United States for larger U.S. hegemony – form the subject of this introductory chapter.

### Economy Impact – AT: Growth Bad - Environment

#### Growth bad arguments are backwards – recessions actually undermine moves towards sustainability.

Astrid Matthey, Max-Planck-Institute of Economics, 2/18/2009, “Less is more: The influence of aspirations and priming on well-being,” http://www.econ.mpg.de/files/2009/staff/matthey/Extended%20Paper%20De-Growth\_rev.pdf

Global political and economic events like the current economic crisis have a considerable impact on the focus on consumption, and on consumption levels in the short and medium run. The crisis started as a real-estate crisis in the U.S. in early 2008, but quickly developed into a global financial crisis with wide ranging effects on the real economy. In the short run, the crisis may lead to a decrease in average consumption levels by causing a worldwide recession. In the medium- to long-run, however, it may increase the focus on the economic sphere in general, and on consumption in particular, and lead to increased resistance against a reduction in consumption levels in the industrialized countries. First, the excessive news coverage of the crisis with its emphasis on the implications for wealth and consumption must be expected to serve as a priming device. This priming increases people’s reference states regarding material achievements and hence decreases their well-being at any given level of consumption. Second, the pronounced focus of policy makers and the media on economic issues strengthens the public’s perception that economic development and consumption are the primary goals to strive for. This aggravates the downward adjustment of reference states regarding consumption and increases the perceived severity of losses if consumption levels decrease. In addition, it supports the view that environmental protection is a policy we can only afford to pursue in times of economic flourishing. Third, the persistent assertion by politicians and the media that people will experience large (material) losses in the near future makes them feel at a loss already at present (a loss in anticipatory utility), and induces fear of further losses. Taken together, these effects increase people’s focus on consumption and lead to a feeling of loss in this dimension. As a result, any policy that is not aimed at restoring economic growth and increasing consumption will receive only marginal support. The results of this process could already be observed at several climate change conferences of the EU and UN at the end of 2008, and continue to manifest themselves in the public discussion.

#### Growth key to the environment – tech improvement.

Daniel Ben-Ami, journalist/author specializing in economics, editor of Fund Strategy, The Independent, 10/20/2010, http://blogs.independent.co.uk/2010/10/20/prosperity-without-growth-a-contradiction-in-terms/

Of course it does not follow from the enormous benefits of growth that the world is perfect. Far from it. But what we need is more growth, rather than less, to overcome the remaining challenges. Take the example of climate change. The conventional green-tinged view is that we need to limit economic growth to stop us destroying the planet. From this perspective the emphasis must be on individual consumers making sacrifices by consuming less. Such an approach could not be more wrong. To tackle climate change, to the extent it is a problem, we need more resources and better technology rather than less. For example, we can construct more nuclear power stations, build higher sea walls to resist flooding and investigate more high technology solutions. We need an investment in practical engineering-based solutions rather than cheap moralising by politicians and pundits. The end of scarcity is a precondition for human beings to achieve the good life. Economic growth, and social progress more generally, is central to the full realisation of our humanity.

### Economy Impact – AT: Growth Bad

#### No transition to de-growth – recession will make it harder to protect the environment.

Astrid Matthey, Max-Planck-Institute of Economics, 2/18/2009, “Less is more: The influence of aspirations and priming on well-being,” http://www.econ.mpg.de/files/2009/staff/matthey/Extended%20Paper%20De-Growth\_rev.pdf

In addition, even before the crisis people did not associate environmental protection with economic de-growth, but with rapid economic growth. In the above mentioned survey, 76% of the subjects agreed with the statement ”In order to cope with climate change and other environmental problems, we primarily need rapid economic growth, because the necessary measures cost a lot of money.”. This attitude, too, must be expected to strengthen as a result of the current extreme focus on economic issues. Bringing about moderation and de-growth will not be easier during or after the crisis than it was before. Given this situation, the World Wide Fund For Nature’s (WWF) warning that ”The ecological crisis will hit us several times harder than the current financial crisis, and will sooner or later jeopardize the well-being and development of all nations.” (Heinrich, 2008) must be suspected to fall on deaf ears.

### Economy Impact – AT: Growth Unsustainable

#### Growth is infinite and sustainable.

Daniel Ben-Ami, journalist/author specializing in economics, editor of Fund Strategy,11/7/2010, “Response to Tim Jackson,” http://danielbenami.com/2010/11/07/response-to-tim-jackson/

He fails to take up the central point of my introduction: that human activity is not constrained by a finite planet. In my speech I used the example of oil to make this point. Humanity can overcome scarcity by using oil more efficiently, finding new sources of oil and ultimately using substitute sources of energy such as nuclear. We are not constrained by limited amounts of energy (or “the second law of thermodynamics”). In addition, the challenges posed by climate change (or environmental “sinks”) can be overcome by the application of technology. \* Just one example of the mainstream character of growth scepticism. Jackson’s Prosperity without Growth, by his own acknowledgement, draws heavily on the work of Amartya Sen with its concepts of “capabilities” and “flourishing”. Yet Sen won the Nobel prize in economics in 1998 – hardly a sign of a marginal viewpoint. He is also a professor at Harvard and was formerly the master of Trinity College, Cambridge. In addition, Sen’s notion of “development as freedom” was central to the conceptual foundations of the United Nations Development Programme’s notion of “human development”. Sen was a consultant on the first Human Development Report in 1990 and he wrote the introduction to this year’s 20th anniversary edition. In other words, Sen’s views are central to today’s mainstream (and in my view impoverished) development consensus. \* It is strange to see Jackson so baffled by my contention that human activity should not be modeled on behaviour seen in nature. Nowadays I am in a minority but I am far from alone in upholding human exceptionalism: the belief that humans have unique qualities that set them apart from the rest of nature. The dismal record of Malthusians in predicting human starvation illustrates my point. Thomas Malthus famously argued in 1798 that human population growth tended to outstrip the rise in food supply. Therefore, in his view, mass starvation would ultimately keep the number of humans in check. In the event his predictions proved completely wrong as the food supply surged alongside population growth. Yet the Malthusian model probably does work for all other animals besides humans. If, say, ant or lion populations grow too rapidly their numbers could well be held in check by mass starvation. However, humans, with their unique capabilities, are different. This support for human exceptionalism is indeed the central difference between myself and Jackson. More generally it is what separates classical humanism from green thinking.

#### No limits to growth – we just need better policy.

David Leonhardt, economics columnist for The Times and a staff writer for the magazine, 1/27/2009, “The Big Fix,” New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2009/02/01/magazine/01Economy-t.html

So for the first time in more than 70 years, the epicenter of the American economy can be placed outside of California or New York or the industrial Midwest. It can be placed in Washington. Washington won’t merely be given the task of pulling the economy out of the immediate crisis. It will also have to figure out how to put the American economy on a more sustainable path — to help it achieve fast, broadly shared growth and do so without the benefit of a bubble. Obama said as much in his inauguration speech when he pledged to overhaul Washington’s approach to education, health care, science and infrastructure, all in an effort to “lay a new foundation for growth.” For centuries, people have worried that economic growth had limits — that the only way for one group to prosper was at the expense of another. The pessimists, from Malthus and the Luddites and on, have been proved wrong again and again. Growth is not finite. But it is also not inevitable. It requires a strategy.

#### Fast growth turns all their impacts.

David Leonhardt, economics columnist for The Times and a staff writer for the magazine, 1/27/2009, “The Big Fix,” New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2009/02/01/magazine/01Economy-t.html

That last question may sound abstract, even technical, compared with the current crisis. Yet the consequences of a country’s growth rate are not abstract at all. Slow growth makes almost all problems worse. Fast growth helps solve them. As Paul Romer, an economist at Stanford University, has said, the choices that determine a country’s growth rate “dwarf all other economic-policy concerns.” Growth is the only way for a government to pay off its debts in a relatively quick and painless fashion, allowing tax revenues to increase without tax rates having to rise. That is essentially what happened in the years after World War II. When the war ended, the federal government’s debt equaled 120 percent of the gross domestic product (more than twice as high as its likely level by the end of next year). The rapid economic growth of the 1950s and ’60s — more than 4 percent a year, compared with 2.5 percent in this decade — quickly whittled that debt away. Over the coming 25 years, if growth could be lifted by just one-tenth of a percentage point a year, the extra tax revenue would completely pay for an $800 billion stimulus package.

### Uniqueness – Hegemony Low Now

#### Hegemony low now – domestic problems.

Michael A. Cohen, fellow at the Century Foundation, 2/21/2012, “Rotting from the Inside Out,” Foreign Policy, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/02/21/rotting\_from\_the\_inside\_out?page=full

There is, however, one serious problem with this analysis. Any discussion of American national security that focuses solely on the issue of U.S. power vis-à-vis other countries -- and ignores domestic inputs -- is decidedly incomplete. In Kagan's New Republic article, for example, he has little to say about the country's domestic challenges except to obliquely argue that to focus on "nation-building" at home while ignoring the importance of maintaining U.S. power abroad would be a mistake. In fact, in a recent FP debate with the Financial Times' Gideon Rachman on the issue of American decline, Kagan diagnoses what he, and many other political analysts, appear to believe is the country's most serious problem: "enormous fiscal deficits driven by entitlements." Why is this bad? It makes it harder, says Kagan, for the United States to "continue playing its vital role in the world" and will lead to significant cutbacks in defense spending. However, a focus on U.S. global dominance or suasion that doesn't factor in those elements that constitute American power at home ignores substantial and worsening signs of decline. Indeed, by virtually any measure, a closer look at the state of the United States today tells a sobering tale of rapid and unchecked decay and deterioration in a host of areas. While not all of them are generally considered elements of national security, perhaps they should be.

#### Hegemony low now – measures of power don’t reflect inability to accomplish US goals.

Stephen Walt, 1/26/2012, professor of international relations at Harvard University, “Whether or not the U.S. is declining is the wrong question,” Foreign Policy, http://walt.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2012/01/26/asking\_the\_wrong\_question\_about\_the\_us\_and\_china

The United States remains very powerful -- especially when compared with some putative opponents like Iran -- but its capacity to lead security and economic orders in every corner of the world has been diminished by failures in Iraq (and eventually, Afghanistan), by the burden of debt accumulated over the past decade, by the economic melt-down in 2007-2008, and by the emergence of somewhat stronger and independent actors in Brazil, Turkey, India, and elsewhere. One might also point to eroding national infrastructure and an educational system that impresses hardly anyone. Moreover, five decades of misguided policies have badly tarnished America's image in many parts of the world, and especially in the Middle East and Central Asia. The erosion of authoritarian rule in the Arab world will force new governments to pay more attention to popular sentiment -- which is generally hostile to the broad thrust of U.S. policy in the region -- and the United States will be less able to rely on close relations with tame monarchs or military dictators henceforth. If it the United States remains far and away the world's strongest state, its ability to get its way in world affairs is declining.

### Uniqueness – Hegemony Low Now

#### US hegemony declining.

Christopher Layne, Professor in National Security at Texas A & M University’s George H. W. Bush School of Government and Public Service, 4/25/2012, “The Global Power Shift from West to East,” The National Interest, http://nationalinterest.org/profile/christopher-layne

Such protestations, however, cannot forestall real-world developments that collectively are challenging the post-1945 international order, often called Pax Americana, in which the United States employed its overwhelming power to shape and direct global events. That era of American dominance is drawing to a close as the country’s relative power declines, along with its ability to manage global economics and security. This does not mean the United States will go the way of Great Britain during the first half of the twentieth century. As Harvard’s Stephen Walt wrote in this magazine last year, it is more accurate to say the “American Era” is nearing its end. For now, and for some time to come, the United States will remain primus inter pares—the strongest of the major world powers—though it is uncertain whether it can maintain that position over the next twenty years. Regardless, America’s power and influence over the international political system will diminish markedly from what it was at the apogee of Pax Americana. That was the Old Order, forged through the momentous events of World War I, the Great Depression and World War II. Now that Old Order of nearly seven decades’ duration is fading from the scene. It is natural that U.S. leaders would want to deny it—or feel they must finesse it when talking to the American people. But the real questions for America and its leaders are: What will replace the Old Order? How can Washington protect its interests in the new global era? And how much international disruption will attend the transition from the old to the new?

### Uniqueness - AT: Heg Resilient

#### Resiliency arguments wrong – misunderstand declines in allied power.

Charles Kupchan, Professor of International Affairs at Georgetown University, 3/20/2012, “The Decline of the West: Why America Must Prepare for the End of Dominance,” The Atlantic, http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/03/the-decline-of-the-west-why-america-must-prepare-for-the-end-of-dominance/254779/

American primacy is not as resilient as Kagan thinks. His most serious error is his argument that Americans need not worry about the ascent of new powers because only Europe and Japan are losing ground to them; the United States is keeping pace. It's true that the U.S. share of global output has held at roughly 25 percent for several decades. It's also the case that "the rise of China, India, and other Asian nations ... has so far come almost entirely at the expense of Europe and Japan, which have had a declining share of the global economy." But this is not, as Kagan implies, good news for the United States. The long run of Western hegemony has been the product of teamwork, not of America acting alone. Through the 19th century and up until World War II, Europe led the effort to spread liberal democracy and capitalism--and to guide Western nations to a position of global dominance. Not until the postwar era did the United States take over stewardship of the West. Pax Britannica set the stage for Pax Americana, and Washington inherited from its European allies a liberal international order that rested on solid commercial and strategic foundations. Moreover, America's many successes during the past 70 years would not have been possible without the power and purpose of Europe and Japan by its side. Whether defeating communism, liberalizing the global economy, combating nuclear proliferation, or delivering humanitarian assistance, Western allies formed a winning coalition that made effective action possible.

#### Policy choice determines resilience – no inevitability of hegemony absent the right plan.

Robert W. Merry, editor of The National Interest, 2/8/2012, “Understanding America's Fall,” The National Interest, http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/understanding-americas-fall-6473?page=1

Here’s where the analysis gets a bit ragged. Contra Krauthammer, great powers never make a "choice" to slip into decline. They may choose to accept the decline that fate forces upon them, as Britain eventually did. But the choice is really over what kinds of policies a great power wishes to pursue on the global stage and whether those policies will bolster or undermine its global status. Hence, Kagan’s catalogue of America’s Cold War defeats and difficulties is instructive but perhaps not precisely as he intends. He seems to be saying that all great powers experience such defeats and difficulties, so we should just go for it. A better lesson is that such experiences suggest caution, a measured approach to foreign policy that preserves power for when it’s really needed and places power bets that are commensurate with the possible payoff—and the risks involved.

#### Resilience no inevitable – boosting infrastructure key.

Stephen E. Flynn, Senior Fellow for National Security Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, March/April 2008, “Defying Terrorism and Mitigating Natural Disasters,” Foreign Affairs, http://www.sovrn.com/PDF/articles\_America\_the\_Resilient.pdf

Such resilience results from a sustained commitment to four factors. First, there is robustness, the ability to keep operating or to stay standing in the face of disaster. In some cases, it translates into designing structures or systems (such as buildings and bridges) strong enough to take a foreseeable punch. In others (such as developing transportation, energy, and communications networks), robustness requires devising substitutable or redundant systems that can be brought to bear should something important break or stop working. Robustness also entails investing in and maintaining elements of critical infrastructure, such as dams and levees, so that they can withstand low-probability but highconsequence events.

### Solvency – AT: Decline Inevitable/Heg Unsustainable

#### Decline not inevitable – no overstretch and costs aren’t too high.

Michael Beckley, research fellow in the International Security Program at Harvard Kennedy School’s

Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Winter 2011/2012, “China’s Century? Why America’s Edge Will Endure,” International Security, http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Chinas\_Century.pdf

To be sure, the costs of maintaining U.S. military superiority are substantial. By historical standards, however, they are exceptionally small. Past hegemons succumbed to imperial overstretch after fighting multifront wars against major powers and spending more than 10 percent (and often 100 or 200 percent) of their GDPs on defense. The United States, by contrast, spends 4 percent of its GDP on defense and concentrates its enmity on rogue nations and failed states. Past bids for global mastery were strangled before hegemony could be fully consolidated. The United States, on the other hand, has the advantage of being an extant hegemon—it did not overturn an existing international order; rather, the existing order collapsed around it. As a result, its dominant position is entrenched to the point that “any effort to compete directly with the United States is futile, so no one tries.”

#### No inevitable decline – US must reassert leadership.

Robert Kagan, senior fellow in foreign policy at the Brookings Institution, 1/11/2012, “Not Fade Away,” The New Republic, http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/magazine/99521/america-world-power-declinism?page=0,1&passthru=ZDkyNzQzZTk3YWY3YzE0OWM5MGRiZmIwNGQwNDBiZmI&utm\_source=Editors%20and%20Bloggers&utm\_campaign=cbaee91d9d-Edit\_and\_Blogs&utm\_medium=email

In the end, the decision is in the hands of Americans. Decline, as Charles Krauthammer has observed, is a choice. It is not an inevitable fate—at least not yet. Empires and great powers rise and fall, and the only question is when. But the when does matter. Whether the United States begins to decline over the next two decades or not for another two centuries will matter a great deal, both to Americans and to the nature of the world they live in.

#### Heg sustainable – it’s just a question of making necessary policy changes.

Joseph Nye, Professor at Harvard, 2/14/2011, “The Misleading Metaphor of Decline ,” Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704358704576118673650278558.html

Looking back at history, the British strategist Lawrence Freedman notes two features that distinguish the U.S. from the dominant great powers of the past: American power is based on alliances rather than colonies, and it is associated with an ideology that is flexible and to which America can return even after it has overextended itself. Looking to the future, Anne-Marie Slaughter of Princeton argues that America's culture of openness and innovation will keep it central in an information age when networks supplement, if not fully replace, hierarchical power. On the question of absolute rather than relative American decline, the U.S. faces serious problems in areas like debt, secondary education and political gridlock. But solutions exist. Among the possible negative futures are ones in which the U.S. overreacts to terrorist attacks by closing inwards and thus cuts itself off from the strength that it obtains from openness. But there are answers to major American problems that preoccupy us today, such as long-term debt (see the recommendations of recent deficit commissions) and political gridlock (for example, changes in redistricting procedures to reduce gerrymandering). Such solutions may remain forever out of reach, but it is important to distinguish situations where there are no solutions from those that could in principle be solved.

### Heg Impact – Great Power War

#### Only US hegemony prevents great power war.

Robert Kagan, senior fellow in foreign policy at the Brookings Institution, 1/11/2012, “Not Fade Away,” The New Republic, <http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/magazine/99521/america-world-power-declinism?page=0,1&passthru=ZDkyNzQzZTk3YWY3YzE0OWM5MGRiZmIwNGQwNDBiZmI&utm_source=Editors%20and%20Bloggers&utm_campaign=cbaee91d9d-Edit_and_Blogs&utm_medium=email>

The underlying assumption of such a course is that the present world order will more or less persist without American power, or at least with much less of it; or that others can pick up the slack; or simply that the benefits of the world order are permanent and require no special exertion by anyone. Unfortunately, the present world order—with its widespread freedoms, its general prosperity, and its absence of great power conflict—is as fragile as it is unique. Preserving it has been a struggle in every decade, and will remain a struggle in the decades to come. Preserving the present world order requires constant American leadership and constant American commitment.

#### Multipolarity fails – only US hegemony sustains great power peace.

Robert Kagan, senior fellow in foreign policy at the Brookings Institution, 2/11/2012, “Why the World Needs America,” Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203646004577213262856669448.html

There is little reason to believe that a return to multipolarity in the 21st century would bring greater peace and stability than it has in the past. The era of American predominance has shown that there is no better recipe for great-power peace than certainty about who holds the upper hand. President Bill Clinton left office believing that the key task for America was to "create the world we would like to live in when we are no longer the world's only superpower," to prepare for "a time when we would have to share the stage." It is an eminently sensible-sounding proposal. But can it be done? For particularly in matters of security, the rules and institutions of international order rarely survive the decline of the nations that erected them. They are like scaffolding around a building: They don't hold the building up; the building holds them up.

#### They can’t win an impact turn – alternatives to US hegemony more likely to cause great power war.

Robert Kagan, senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and senior transatlantic fellow at the German Marshall Fund, 7/19/2007, “End of Dreams, Return of History,” RealClearPolitics, http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2007/07/end\_of\_dreams\_return\_of\_histor.html

This is a good thing, and it should continue to be a primary goal of American foreign policy to perpetuate this relatively benign international configuration of power. The unipolar order with the United States as the predominant power is unavoidably riddled with flaws and contradictions. It inspires fears and jealousies. The United States is not immune to error, like all other nations, and because of its size and importance in the international system those errors are magnified and take on greater significance than the errors of less powerful nations. Compared to the ideal Kantian international order, in which all the world 's powers would be peace-loving equals, conducting themselves wisely, prudently, and in strict obeisance to international law, the unipolar system is both dangerous and unjust. Compared to any plausible alternative in the real world, however, it is relatively stable and less likely to produce a major war between great powers. It is also comparatively benevolent, from a liberal perspective, for it is more conducive to the principles of economic and political liberalism that Americans and many others value.

### Heg Impact – Transition wars

#### Decline in hegemony spurs reckless foreign policy behavior and preventive war.

Michael Beckley, research fellow in the International Security Program at Harvard Kennedy School’s

Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Winter 2011/2012, “China’s Century? Why America’s Edge Will Endure,” International Security, http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Chinas\_Century.pdf

Another danger is that declinism may impair foreign policy decisionmaking. If top government officials come to believe that China is overtaking the United States, they are likely to react in one of two ways, both of which are potentially disastrous. The first is that policymakers may imagine the United States faces a closing “window of opportunity” and should take action “while it still enjoys preponderance and not wait until the diffusion of power has already made international politics more competitive and unpredictable.” This belief may spur positive action, but it also invites parochial thinking, reckless behavior, and preventive war. As Robert Gilpin and others have shown, “[H]egemonic struggles have most frequently been triggered by fears of ultimate decline and the perceived erosion of power.” By fanning such fears, declinists may inadvertently promote the type of violent overreaction that they seek to prevent.

#### Decline of US hegemony causes a power vacuum – guarantees conflict and economic collapse.

Niall Ferguson, professor of history at NYU and a senior fellow of the Hoover Institution, 6/21/2004, “The End of Power,” Wall Street Journal, http://www.opinionjournal.com/editorial/feature.html?id=110005244

But what if this view is wrong? What if the world is heading for a period when there is no hegemon? What if, instead of a balance of power, there is an absence of power? Such a situation is not unknown in history. Though the chroniclers of the past have long been preoccupied with the achievements of great powers--whether civilizations, empires or nation states--they have not wholly overlooked eras when power has receded. Unfortunately, the world's experience with power vacuums is hardly encouraging. Anyone who dislikes U.S. hegemony should bear in mind that, instead of a multipolar world of competing great powers, a world with no hegemon at all may be the real alternative to it. This could turn out to mean a new Dark Age of waning empires and religious fanaticism; of endemic rapine in the world's no-go zones; of economic stagnation and a retreat by civilization into a few fortified enclaves.

### Heg Impact – Transition wars

#### Withdrawal of American conflict only causes new great power competition, conflict, and American re-engagement.

Robert Kagan, senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and senior transatlantic fellow at the German Marshall Fund, 7/19/2007, “End of Dreams, Return of History,” RealClearPolitics, http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2007/07/end\_of\_dreams\_return\_of\_histor.html

The subtraction of American power from any region would not end conflict but would simply change the equation. In the Middle East, competition for influence among powers both inside and outside the region has raged for at least two centuries. The rise of Islamic fundamentalism doesn 't change this. It only adds a new and more threatening dimension to the competition, which neither a sudden end to the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians nor an immediate American withdrawal from Iraq would change. The alternative to American predominance in the region is not balance and peace. It is further competition. The region and the states within it remain relatively weak. A diminution of American influence would not be followed by a diminution of other external influences. One could expect deeper involvement by both China and Russia, if only to secure their interests. And one could also expect the more powerful states of the region, particularly Iran, to expand and fill the vacuum. It is doubtful that any American administration would voluntarily take actions that could shift the balance of power in the Middle East further toward Russia, China, or Iran. The world hasn't changed that much. An American withdrawal from Iraq will not return things to "normal" or to a new kind of stability in the region. It will produce a new instability, one likely to draw the United States back in again. The alternative to American regional predominance in the Middle East and elsewhere is not a new regional stability. In an era of burgeoning nationalism, the future is likely to be one of intensified competition among nations and nationalist movements. Difficult as it may be to extend American predominance into the future, no one should imagine that a reduction of American power or a retraction of American influence and global involvement will provide an easier path.

### Heg Impact – Climate Change and Disease

#### Hegemony key to global solutions for climate change and disease.

Michael Beckley, research fellow in the International Security Program at Harvard Kennedy School’s

Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Winter 2011/2012, “China’s Century? Why America’s Edge Will Endure,” International Security, http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Chinas\_Century.pdf

The other potential reaction is retrenchment—the divestment of all foreign policy obligations save those linked to vital interests, defined in a narrow and national manner. Advocates of retrenchment assume, or hope, that the world will sort itself out on its own; that whatever replaces American hegemony, whether it be a return to balance of power politics or a transition to a postpower paradise, will naturally maintain international order and prosperity. Order and prosperity, however, are unnatural. They can never be presumed. When achieved, they are the result of determined action by powerful actors and, in particular, by the most powerful actor, which is, and will be for some time, the United States. Arms buildups, insecure sea-lanes, and closed markets are only the most obvious risks of U.S. retrenchment. Less obvious are transnational problems, such as global warming, water scarcity, and disease, which may fester without a leader to rally collective action.

#### Runaway warming causes extinction.

Oliver Tickell, British journalist, author and campaigner on health and environment issues, and author of the Kyoto2 climate initiative, 8/11/2008, “On a planet 4C hotter, all we can prepare for is extinction,” The Guardian, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/aug/11/climatechange

We need to get prepared for four degrees of global warming, Bob Watson told the Guardian last week. At first sight this looks like wise counsel from the climate science adviser to Defra. But the idea that we could adapt to a 4C rise is absurd and dangerous. Global warming on this scale would be a catastrophe that would mean, in the immortal words that Chief Seattle probably never spoke, "the end of living and the beginning of survival" for humankind. Or perhaps the beginning of our extinction. The collapse of the polar ice caps would become inevitable, bringing long-term sea level rises of 70-80 metres. All the world's coastal plains would be lost, complete with ports, cities, transport and industrial infrastructure, and much of the world's most productive farmland. The world's geography would be transformed much as it was at the end of the last ice age, when sea levels rose by about 120 metres to create the Channel, the North Sea and Cardigan Bay out of dry land. Weather would become extreme and unpredictable, with more frequent and severe droughts, floods and hurricanes. The Earth's carrying capacity would be hugely reduced. Billions would undoubtedly die. Watson's call was supported by the government's former chief scientific adviser, Sir David King, who warned that "if we get to a four-degree rise it is quite possible that we would begin to see a runaway increase". This is a remarkable understatement. The climate system is already experiencing significant feedbacks, notably the summer melting of the Arctic sea ice. The more the ice melts, the more sunshine is absorbed by the sea, and the more the Arctic warms. And as the Arctic warms, the release of billions of tonnes of methane – a greenhouse gas 70 times stronger than carbon dioxide over 20 years – captured under melting permafrost is already under way.

### Heg Impact – Climate Change and Disease

#### Disease spread causes extinction.

Brandon Keim, Associate Editor of Wired Science, 11/5/2008, “Disease Can Cause Extinction of Mammals,” Wired, http://www.wired.com/wiredscience/2008/11/yes-disease-can/

Disease can drive a mammal species to extinction: this doesn’t seem surprising, but until today it hadn’t been proven. And now that it has, members of our own mammalian species might understandably feel uneasy. The extinction in question took place a century ago on Christmas Island, an uninhabited Indian Ocean atoll to which a merchant ship inadvertently carried flea-ridden black rats. Within a decade, both of the island’s native rat species were extinct. Scientists have argued whether the native rats were outcompeted by the newcomers, or fell victim to diseases carried by the fleas. According to DNA analysis of remaining native rat specimens, infection was widespread within the population after contact, and nonexistent before — suggesting that disease caused the die-off. Resolving this argument has implications for another debate, over the hypothesis that disease can be so lethal and contagious as to drive a mammal species extinct. This had been observed in snails and amphibians, but not in mammals. The authors of the study, published today in Public Library of Science ONE, hope conservationists will take heed: accidentally-introduced pathogens could wipe out endangered species. But to me, the findings also have human implications. Some would say that the rats were vulnerable because they lived on an island; but the Earth is an island, too.

### Heg Impact – Free Trade/Trade Conflicts

#### Decline of hegemony causes trade conflicts.

Michael Beckley, research fellow in the International Security Program at Harvard Kennedy School’s

Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Winter 2011/2012, “China’s Century? Why America’s Edge Will Endure,” International Security, http://belfercenter.ksg.harvard.edu/files/Chinas\_Century.pdf

One danger is that declinism could prompt trade conflicts and immigration restrictions. The results of this study suggest that the United States benefits immensely from the free flow of goods, services, and people around the globe; this is what allows American corporations to specialize in high-value activities, exploit innovations created elsewhere, and lure the brightest minds to the United States, all while reducing the price of goods for U.S. consumers. Characterizing China’s export expansion as a loss for the United States is not just bad economics; it blazes a trail for jingoistic and protectionist policies. It would be tragically ironic if Americans reacted to false prophecies of decline by cutting themselves off from a potentially vital source of American power.

#### US hegemony key to preserve free trade and prevent trade conflicts.

Robert Kagan, senior fellow in foreign policy at the Brookings Institution, 2/11/2012, “Why the World Needs America,” Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203646004577213262856669448.html

What about the economic order of free markets and free trade? People assume that China and other rising powers that have benefited so much from the present system would have a stake in preserving it. They wouldn't kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. Unfortunately, they might not be able to help themselves. The creation and survival of a liberal economic order has depended, historically, on great powers that are both willing and able to support open trade and free markets, often with naval power. If a declining America is unable to maintain its long-standing hegemony on the high seas, would other nations take on the burdens and the expense of sustaining navies to fill in the gaps? Even if they did, would this produce an open global commons—or rising tension? China and India are building bigger navies, but the result so far has been greater competition, not greater security. As Mohan Malik has noted in this newspaper, their "maritime rivalry could spill into the open in a decade or two," when India deploys an aircraft carrier in the Pacific Ocean and China deploys one in the Indian Ocean. The move from American-dominated oceans to collective policing by several great powers could be a recipe for competition and conflict rather than for a liberal economic order.

#### US hegemony key to free trade – enforces international laws and cooperation.

David Brooks, co-founder of Politablog, 1/8/2010, “Realism and US Hegemony,” Politablog, http://www.politablog.com/david-brooks/realism-and-the-us-hegemony/

Realist thought has become commonplace among the policy makers in the United States. One of the central thoughts that run parallel to realist thought is hegemonic stability theory. This theory asserts that for the international system to function properly there must be a hegemon. The hegemon must be able to create and enforce international law and norms, set precedent in technological and military prowess and be willing to assume the role of world power. The world system will suffer without a hegemon because international laws cannot be enforced, trade slows down and financial centers collapse. The United States has assumed the role of hegemon since the collapse of the Soviet Union, since then there has been unprecedented economic cooperation, growth and security. With rational policy makers and sound economic policy the United States will remain the hegemon for many more years.

### Heg Impact – Democracy

#### US hegemony key to global spread of democracy.

Robert Kagan, senior fellow in foreign policy at the Brookings Institution, 2/11/2012, “Why the World Needs America,” Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203646004577213262856669448.html

If all of this sounds too good to be true, it is. The present world order was largely shaped by American power and reflects American interests and preferences. If the balance of power shifts in the direction of other nations, the world order will change to suit their interests and preferences. Nor can we assume that all the great powers in a post-American world would agree on the benefits of preserving the present order, or have the capacity to preserve it, even if they wanted to. Take the issue of democracy. For several decades, the balance of power in the world has favored democratic governments. In a genuinely post-American world, the balance would shift toward the great-power autocracies. Both Beijing and Moscow already protect dictators like Syria's Bashar al-Assad. If they gain greater relative influence in the future, we will see fewer democratic transitions and more autocrats hanging on to power. The balance in a new, multipolar world might be more favorable to democracy if some of the rising democracies—Brazil, India, Turkey, South Africa—picked up the slack from a declining U.S. Yet not all of them have the desire or the capacity to do it.

#### Global democracy key to prevent extinction.

Larry Diamond, Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution, December 1995, Promoting Democracy in the 1990s, , http://www.wilsoncenter.org/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/di/1.htm.

This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness. LESSONS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY The experience of this century offers important lessons. Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on or to threaten one another. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible because they must answer to their own citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments. They are better bets to honor international treaties since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. Precisely because, within their own borders, they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be built.

### Heg Impact – Democracy

#### US leadership key to global democracy – multipolarity fails.

James Coady, European Union Section Director at the Henry Jackson Society, 10/20/2009, “The Bush Doctrine in Perspective,” http://www.henryjacksonsociety.org/stories.asp?id=1285

President Bush’s foreign policy was deeply unpopular. And it cannot be denied that his administration made serious mistakes in the foreign policy sphere, the lack of post-war planning in Iraq perhaps being the most obvious example. But the Bush doctrine’s aim of maintaining America’s global geopolitical superiority is one that should be welcomed. The editors of Foreign Policy succinctly summed up attitudes to US hegemony when they stated, “Either you believe that Uncle Sam is a benevolent bulwark against chaos or you see him as the all-powerful root of evil.” Those who subscribe to the latter view should consider the alternatives to assertive American global leadership. It is fashionable to label foreign policy during the Bush years as arrogant and hubristic. Yet a return to multipolarity would signify the emergence of a more volatile and dangerous international system hostile to democratic values. Resolute American leadership was invaluable in defeating the two greatest evils of the twentieth century in German National Socialism and Soviet Communism. It will be equally instrumental in managing the current and future threats of this century.

### AT: Multipolarity Solves

#### Decline of US hegemony causes apolarity, terrorism, economic collapse, and nuclear wars.

Niall Ferguson, professor of history at NYU and a senior fellow of the Hoover Institution, 6/21/2004, “The End of Power,” Wall Street Journal, http://www.opinionjournal.com/editorial/feature.html?id=110005244

Waning empires. Religious revivals. Incipient anarchy. A coming retreat into fortified cities. These are the Dark Age experiences that a world without a hyperpower might find itself reliving. The trouble is, of course, that this Dark Age would be an altogether more dangerous one than the one of the ninth century. For the world is roughly 25 times more populous, so that friction between the world's "tribes" is bound to be greater. Technology has transformed production; now societies depend not merely on freshwater and the harvest but also on supplies of mineral oil that are known to be finite. Technology has changed destruction, too: Now it is possible not just to sack a city, but to obliterate it. For more than two decades, globalization has been raising living standards, except where countries have shut themselves off from the process through tyranny or civil war. Deglobalization--which is what a new Dark Age would amount to--would lead to economic depression. As the U.S. sought to protect itself after a second 9/11 devastated Houston, say, it would inevitably become a less open society. And as Europe's Muslim enclaves grow, infiltration of the EU by Islamist extremists could become irreversible, increasing trans-Atlantic tensions over the Middle East to breaking point. Meanwhile, an economic crisis in China could plunge the Communist system into crisis, unleashing the centrifugal forces that have undermined previous Chinese empires. Western investors would lose out, and conclude that lower returns at home are preferable to the risks of default abroad. The worst effects of the Dark Age would be felt on the margins of the waning great powers. With ease, the terrorists could disrupt the freedom of the seas, targeting oil tankers and cruise liners while we concentrate our efforts on making airports secure. Meanwhile, limited nuclear wars could devastate numerous regions, beginning in Korea and Kashmir; perhaps ending catastrophically in the Middle East. The prospect of an apolar world should frighten us a great deal more than it frightened the heirs of Charlemagne. If the U.S. is to retreat from the role of global hegemon--its fragile self-belief dented by minor reversals--its critics must not pretend that they are ushering in a new era of multipolar harmony. The alternative to unpolarity may not be multipolarity at all. It may be a global vacuum of power. Be careful what you wish for.

#### Multipolarity causes global conflict.

Robert Kagan, senior fellow in foreign policy at the Brookings Institution, 2/11/2012, “Why the World Needs America,” Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203646004577213262856669448.html

Most commentators who welcome this scenario imagine that American predominance would be replaced by some kind of multipolar harmony. But multipolar systems have historically been neither particularly stable nor particularly peaceful. Rough parity among powerful nations is a source of uncertainty that leads to miscalculation. Conflicts erupt as a result of fluctuations in the delicate power equation. War among the great powers was a common, if not constant, occurrence in the long periods of multipolarity from the 16th to the 18th centuries, culminating in the series of enormously destructive Europe-wide wars that followed the French Revolution and ended with Napoleon's defeat in 1815.

### AT: Multipolarity Solves

#### Multipolarity comparatively increases conflict – history proves.

William C. Wohlforth, Professor of Government at Dartmouth College, January 2009, “Unipolarity, Status Competition, and Great Power War,” World Politics, p.56

The evidence suggests that narrow and asymmetrical capabilities gaps foster status competition even among states relatively confident of their basic territorial security for the reasons identified in social identity theory and theories of status competition. Broad patterns of evidence are consistent with this expectation, suggesting that unipolarity shapes strategies of identity maintenance in ways that dampen status conflict. The implication is that unipolarity helps explain low levels of military competition and conflict among major powers after 1991 and that a return to bipolarity or multipolarity would increase the likelihood of such conflict.

### AT: Counter-balancing

#### No counter-balancing – their authors misunderstand the current crisis.

William Wohlforth, Professor in the Department of Government at Dartmouth College, March 2012, “How Not to Evaluate Theories,” International Studies Quarterly, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-2478.2011.00708.x/full

At issue are not the facts, but their implications for scholarship. How come every theoretical implication Layne seeks to draw from these facts strikes me as clearly wrong? Cycling between the earlier writings of Layne and other balance-of-power realists, my own work, and Layne’s present essay yields an answer: a lack of analytical consistency. On vivid display in “This Time It’s Real,” this inconsistency is hardly random. Rather, it is all skewed toward an effort to claim that recent events vindicate Layne’s and other balance-of-power realists’ prediction from the early 1990s: unipolarity generates systemic pressures that rapidly move the system back to multipolarity. I argued elsewhere that this prediction derives from an unreflective and ultimately flawed application of neorealist balance-of-power theory to a novel unipolar setting. There was no theoretical basis for the prediction that unipolarity would spark balancing that would rapidly usher in multipolarity. And, as it turns out, there is no evidence that this has occurred or is about to occur. Layne is only able to imply otherwise by committing four serious analytical missteps.

#### US hegemony not causing balancing – decreased US power will causes other states to build up capabilities.

Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, Assistant Professor and Professor in the Department of Government at Dartmouth College, Summer 2005, “Hard Times for Soft Balancing,” International Security, http://www.dartmouth.edu/~govt/docs/BrooksWohlforth-2005-IS%20article.pdf

Although this incentive for enhancing capabilities concerns security and is directly connected to U.S. policy, it has nothing to do with balancing. Balancing, whether hard or soft, is about protection from the security threat emanating directly from a potential hegemon. If it means anything, the soft balancing argument must predict that less U.S. power and lower involvement will reduce incentives for other states to gain relative power. If bargaining rather than balancing is in play, however, then there is no reason to believe that shrinking either U.S. power or the level of its global engagement would reduce other states’ incentives to build up their capabilities. On the contrary, a precipitous U.S. withdrawal from the world—as neo-isolationists are now calling for—could generate new security dynamics that produce much greater incentives for other powers to increase their capabilities.

### AT: Counter-balancing

#### Unipolarity solves the impact to counter-balancing – US will de-escalate conflicts.

William C. Wohlforth, Professor of Government at Dartmouth College, January 2009, “Unipolarity, Status Competition, and Great Power War,” World Politics, pp.53-54

Given its material dominance and activist foreign policy, the United States is a salient factor in the identity politics of all major powers, and it plays a role in most regional hierarchies. Yet there is scant evidence in U.S. foreign policy discourse of concerns analogous to late cold war perceptions of a Soviet “thrust to global preeminence” or mid-nineteenth century British apprehensions about Tsar Nicholas’s “pretensions to be the arbiter of Europe.” Even when rhetoric emanating from the other powers suggests dissatisfaction with the U.S. role, diplomatic episodes rich with potential for such perceptions were resolved by bargaining relatively free from positional concerns: tension in the Taiwan Strait and the 2001 spy plane incident with China, for example, or numerous tense incidents with Russia from Bosnia to Kosovo to more recent regional disputes in post-Soviet Eurasia. On the contrary, under unipolarity U.S. diplomats have frequently adopted policies to enhance the security of the identities of Russia, China, Japan, and India as great (though second-tier) powers, with an emphasis on their regional roles. U.S. officials have urged China to manage the six-party talks on North Korea while welcoming it as a “responsible stakeholder” in the system; they have urged a much larger regional role for Japan; and they have deliberately fostered India’s status as a “responsible” nuclear power. Russia, the country whose elite has arguably confronted the most threats to its identity, has been the object of what appear to be elaborate U.S. status-management policies that included invitations to form a partnership with NATO, play a prominent role in Middle East diplomacy (from which Washington had striven to exclude Moscow for four decades), and to join the rich countries’ club, the G7 (when Russia clearly lacked the economic requisites). Status management policies on this scale appear to be enabled by a unipolar structure that fosters confidence in the security of the United States’ identity as number one. The United States is free to buttress the status of these states as second-tier great powers and key regional players precisely because it faces no serious competition for overall system leadership.

## Highways Aff

### Highways 1AC 1/10

#### Advantage one is the economy:

#### Declining federal funding has placed the Interstate Highway system in a crisis – inoperability is inevitable in the status quo

Andrew Gillman, Director of Public Relations and Performance Marketing at the Road Connection,2/27/2012, “The Future of the U.S. Highway System: A look into the grave situation facing our roadways,” http://www.forconstructionpros.com/whitepaper/10634303/the-future-of-the-us-highway-system

The current situation facing this country’s roadways is dire. With a network of four million miles of public roads, and approximately 594,000 bridges, federal funding is a key resource to keep these lifelines of commerce operable. However, efforts to maintain U.S. roadways are falling short of acceptable. The American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) gave the roads and bridges in this country a grade of D-­‐minus in their last study. The National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission came to the conclusion that over the next 50 years, the government needs to invest at least $225 billion annually to bring the transportation system up to a reasonable level. The ASCE also mentions that to have U.S. roadways brought up to “good” conditions, the government would need to provide $2 trillion over the next 5 years. The shocking statistics surrounding U.S. road infrastructure don’t end there. One fourth of America’s bridges are rated as structurally deficient and in need of repair or upgrade. Transportation experts across the political spectrum agree that this should be a high priority for the U.S. government considering that in the past 40 years, dozens of bridge collapses have occurred resulting in hundreds of fatalities. The U.S highway system is already years past due for a serious upgrade. At this point, we are about 35 years overdue for rebuilding our current roadways, let alone extending our infrastructure with our growing population. Initially, the highway system built by President Eisenhower was only built under the assumption that after 20 to 25 years, it would be replaced.

#### Increasing investment in the Interstate Highway system is key to sustain economic growth

Robert Poole, Director of transportation policy at Reason Foundation, August 2010, “Restoring Trust in the Highway Trust Fund,” reason.org/files/restoring\_highway\_trust\_fund.pdf

But the age of highways, automobiles and trucks is far from being over. Trucks haul the large majority (by value) of all goods moved in America—and FHWA projections show that this truck volume will increase 2.5-fold by 2035. All responsible projections, based on continued growth in both population and GDP, show continued growth in driving, as measured by vehicle miles of travel (VMT), in coming decades—even though the rate of increase in VMT has been slowing down. Decades of spending far more per transit rider than per highway user in our major metropolitan areas has not halted the decline in transit’s market share of travel. People expect, and our economy depends on, improving mobility. We need a system that makes it easier for more people to connect to more places, and it remains roads and personal vehicles and trucks that provide that mobility. Consequently, the need for highway investment will continue.

### Highways 1AC 2/10

#### The US economy is key to the global economy

David Caploe, CEO of the Singapore-incorporated American Centre for Applied Liberal Arts and Humanities in Asia, 4/7/2009, “Focus still on America to lead global recovery,” acalaha.com/STarticle07Apr09.pdf

IN THE aftermath of the G-20 summit, most observers seem to have missed perhaps the most crucial statement of the entire event, made by United States President Barack Obama at his pre-conference meeting with British Prime Minister Gordon Brown: 'The world has become accustomed to the US being a voracious consumer market, the engine that drives a lot of economic growth worldwide,' he said. 'If there is going to be renewed growth, it just can't be the US as the engine.' While superficially sensible, this view is deeply problematic. To begin with, it ignores the fact that the global economy has in fact been 'America-centred' for more than 60 years. Countries - China, Japan, Canada, Brazil, Korea, Mexico and so on - either sell to the US or they sell to countries that sell to the US. This system has generally been advantageous for all concerned. America gained certain historically unprecedented benefits, but the system also enabled participating countries - first in Western Europe and Japan, and later, many in the Third World - to achieve undreamt-of prosperity. At the same time, this deep inter-connection between the US and the rest of the world also explains how the collapse of a relatively small sector of the US economy - 'sub-prime' housing, logarithmically exponentialised by Wall Street's ingenious chicanery - has cascaded into the worst global economic crisis since the Great Depression. To put it simply, Mr Obama doesn't seem to understand that there is no other engine for the world economy - and hasn't been for the last six decades. If the US does not drive global economic growth, growth is not going to happen. Thus, US policies to deal with the current crisis are critical not just domestically, but also to the entire world. Consequently, it is a matter of global concern that the Obama administration seems to be following Japan's 'model' from the 1990s: allowing major banks to avoid declaring massive losses openly and transparently, and so perpetuating 'zombie' banks - technically alive but in reality dead. As analysts like Nobel laureates Joseph Stiglitz and Paul Krugman have pointed out, the administration's unwillingness to confront US banks is the main reason why they are continuing their increasingly inexplicable credit freeze, thus ravaging the American and global economies.

#### Economic decline causes global war

Walter Russell Mead, Henry A. Kissinger senior fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, 2/4/2009, “Only Makes You Stronger,” The New Republic, http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-news/2169866/posts

So far, such half-hearted experiments not only have failed to work; they have left the societies that have tried them in a progressively worse position, farther behind the front-runners as time goes by. Argentina has lost ground to Chile; Russian development has fallen farther behind that of the Baltic states and Central Europe. Frequently, the crisis has weakened the power of the merchants, industrialists, financiers, and professionals who want to develop a liberal capitalist society integrated into the world. Crisis can also strengthen the hand of religious extremists, populist radicals, or authoritarian traditionalists who are determined to resist liberal capitalist society for a variety of reasons. Meanwhile, the companies and banks based in these societies are often less established and more vulnerable to the consequences of a financial crisis than more established firms in wealthier societies. As a result, developing countries and countries where capitalism has relatively recent and shallow roots tend to suffer greater economic and political damage when crisis strikes--as, inevitably, it does. And, consequently, financial crises often reinforce rather than challenge the global distribution of power and wealth. This may be happening yet again. None of which means that we can just sit back and enjoy the recession. History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, so has war. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. Bad economic times can breed wars. Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring Adolf Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to be born? The United States may not, yet, decline, but, if we can't get the world economy back on track, we may still have to fight.

### Highways 1AC 3/10

#### Revitalizing the Interstate Highway system is key to competitiveness

AASHTO, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, February 2007, “TRANSPORTATION INVEST IN OUR FUTURE,” www.transportation1.org/tif1report/TIF1-1.pdf

This congested and antiquated network hinders the United States at a time of soaring international competition. The value of foreign trade to the U.S. economy will nearly triple from the equivalent of 13 percent of GDP in 1990 to 35 percent by 2020. Instead of reducing barriers to this trading boom, America is increasing them by trying to squeeze a greater amount of product through its increasingly congested logistical pipeline. “Transportation—as an integrated system—is an essential component of America’s global competitiveness, and, as such, it can no longer be relegated to the backbench of U.S. public policy.” —Thomas Donohue, President and CEO of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce This prescient observation from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce reflects what is becoming a crisis of confidence in America’s transportation system. To face this crisis and to compete effectively, America needs a new vision and a new strategy. It must build a 21st Century American transportation system that allows every corner of the country to have a modern logistics platform to compete in a new global economy. America’s vaunted status as the most efficient and productive nation in the world is about to slip—unless the public and private sector can respond in time. AASHTO produced this report for the National Surface Transportation Policy and Revenue Study Commission to warn national policy makers of this impending crisis. AASHTO also proposes a series of far-reaching policies that must be adopted if America is to retain its competitive advantage.

#### Collapse of US economic leadership causes global conflict and nuclear escalation

Aaron Friedberg and Gabriel Schoenfeld, professor of politics and international relations at Princeton’s Woodrow Wilson School and visiting scholar at the Witherspoon Institute, 10/21/2008, “The Dangers of a Diminished America ,” Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB122455074012352571.html

Then there are the dolorous consequences of a potential collapse of the world's financial architecture. For decades now, Americans have enjoyed the advantages of being at the center of that system. The worldwide use of the dollar, and the stability of our economy, among other things, made it easier for us to run huge budget deficits, as we counted on foreigners to pick up the tab by buying dollar-denominated assets as a safe haven. Will this be possible in the future? Meanwhile, traditional foreign-policy challenges are multiplying. The threat from al Qaeda and Islamic terrorist affiliates has not been extinguished. Iran and North Korea are continuing on their bellicose paths, while Pakistan and Afghanistan are progressing smartly down the road to chaos. Russia's new militancy and China's seemingly relentless rise also give cause for concern. If America now tries to pull back from the world stage, it will leave a dangerous power vacuum. The stabilizing effects of our presence in Asia, our continuing commitment to Europe, and our position as defender of last resort for Middle East energy sources and supply lines could all be placed at risk. In such a scenario there are shades of the 1930s, when global trade and finance ground nearly to a halt, the peaceful democracies failed to cooperate, and aggressive powers led by the remorseless fanatics who rose up on the crest of economic disaster exploited their divisions. Today we run the risk that rogue states may choose to become ever more reckless with their nuclear toys, just at our moment of maximum vulnerability.
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#### Advantage two is the military:

#### An efficient Interstate Highway system is key to military primacy and power projection

Wendell Cox, Professor of public policy at the Conservatoire National des Arts et Metiers, June 1996, “40 Years of the US Interstate Highway System: An Analysis,”

http://www.publicpurpose.com/freeway1.htm#def

One of the principal reasons for building the interstate highway system was to support national defense. When the system was approved --- during one of the most instable periods of the Cold War, national security dictated development of an efficient national highway system that could move large numbers of military personnel and huge quantities of military equipment and supplies. The interstate highway system effectively performs that function, but perhaps more importantly, its availability provides the nation with a potential resource that could have been reliably called upon if greater military conflict had arisen. Throughout the Cold War (and even to today), America's strategic advantage in effective surface transportation was unchallenged. Even today, no constituent nation of the late Soviet Union has begun to develop such a comprehensive surface transportation system. In the post-communist world, it may be tempting to underestimate the role of the interstate highway system in national defense. But the interstate highway system continues to play a critical role. The U.S. military's Strategic Highway Corridor Network (STAHNET) relies primarily on the interstate highway network, which represents 75 percent of network mileage. The U.S. Army cited the that system as being critical to the success of the 1990-1991 "Desert Shield-Desert Storm operation (the U.S. led operation to free Kuwait from Iraq): Much of the success of the operation was due to our logistical ability to rapidly move troops to the theater. The capacity of the U.S. highway system to support the mobilization of troops and to move equipment and forces to U.S. ports of embarkation was key to successful deployment. The Army also noted the "modal redundancy" of the highway system, which provided rapid and effective movements of a military division when difficulties with a rail line precluded the planned transport by rail. This illustrates the fact that the interstate highway system continues to play an important role in national defense, even in the post-Cold War era.
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#### Primacy dramatically reduces the risk of great power conflict – power projection stabilizes regional conflict and dampens miscalculation

Stephen Walt, Professor of International Relations at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, Spring 2002, “American Primacy: Its Prospects and Pitfalls,” Naval War College Review, pg. 9

A second consequence of U.S. primacy is a decreased danger of great-power rivalry and a higher level of overall international tranquility. Ironically, those who argue that primacy is no longer important, because the danger of war is slight, overlook the fact that the extent of American primacy is one of the main reasons why the risk of great-power war is as low as it is. For most of the past four centuries, relations among the major powers have been intensely competitive, often punctuated by major wars and occasionally by all-out struggles for hegemony. In the first half of the twentieth century, for example, great-power wars killed over eighty million people. Today, however, the dominant position of the United States places significant limits on the possibility of great-power competition, for at least two reasons. One reason is that because the United States is currently so far ahead, other major powers are not inclined to challenge its dominant position. Not only is there no possibility of a “hegemonic war” (because there is no potential hegemon to mount a challenge), but the risk of war via miscalculation is reduced by the overwhelming gap between the United States and the other major powers. Miscalculation is more likely to lead to war when the balance of power is fairly even, because in this situation both sides can convince themselves that they might be able to win. When the balance of power is heavily skewed, however, the leading state does not need to go to war and weaker states dare not try.8 The second reason is that the continued deployment of roughly two hundred thousand troops in Europe and in Asia provides a further barrier to conflict in each region. So long as U.S. troops are committed abroad, regional powers know that launching a war is likely to lead to a confrontation with the United States. Thus, states within these regions do not worry as much about each other, because the U.S. presence effectively prevents regional conflicts from breaking out. What Joseph Joffe has termed the “American pacifier” is not the only barrier to conflict in Europe and Asia, but it is an important one. This tranquilizing effect is not lost on America’s allies in Europe and Asia. They resent U.S. dominance and dislike playing host to American troops, but they also do not want “Uncle Sam” to leave.9 Thus, U.S. primacy is of benefit to the United States, and to other countries as well, because it dampens the overall level of international insecurity. World politics might be more interesting if the United States were weaker and if other states were forced to compete with each other more actively, but a more exciting world is not necessarily a better one. A comparatively boring era may provide few opportunities for genuine heroism, but it is probably a good deal more pleasant to live in than “interesting” decades like the 1930s or 1940s.
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#### Military primacy key to sustain international trade

Zhang, Researcher Carnegie, and Shi, Consultant for Eurasia Group and World Bank, 2011 (Yuhan and Lin, January 22, “America’s decline: A harbinger of conflict and rivalry” East Asia Forum, http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2011/01/22/americas-decline-a-harbinger-of-conflict-and-rivalry/)

Over the past two decades, no other state has had the ability to seriously challenge the US military. Under these circumstances, motivated by both opportunity and fear, many actors have bandwagoned with US hegemony and accepted a subordinate role. Canada, most of Western Europe, India, Japan, South Korea, Australia, Singapore and the Philippines have all joined the US, creating a status quo that has tended to mute great power conflicts. However, as the hegemony that drew these powers together withers, so will the pulling power behind the US alliance. The result will be an international order where power is more diffuse, American interests and influence can be more readily challenged, and conflicts or wars may be harder to avoid. As history attests, power decline and redistribution result in military confrontation. For example, in the late 19th century America’s emergence as a regional power saw it launch its first overseas war of conquest towards Spain. By the turn of the 20th century, accompanying the increase in US power and waning of British power, the American Navy had begun to challenge the notion that Britain ‘rules the waves.’ Such a notion would eventually see the US attain the status of sole guardians of the Western Hemisphere’s security to become the order-creating Leviathan shaping the international system with democracy and rule of law. Defining this US-centred system are three key characteristics: enforcement of property rights, constraints on the actions of powerful individuals and groups and some degree of equal opportunities for broad segments of society. As a result of such political stability, free markets, liberal trade and flexible financial mechanisms have appeared. And, with this, many countries have sought opportunities to enter this system, proliferating stable and cooperative relations. However, what will happen to these advances as America’s influence declines? Given that America’s authority, although sullied at times, has benefited people across much of Latin America, Central and Eastern Europe, the Balkans, as well as parts of Africa and, quite extensively, Asia, the answer to this question could affect global society in a profoundly detrimental way. Public imagination and academia have anticipated that a post-hegemonic world would return to the problems of the 1930s: regional blocs, trade conflicts and strategic rivalry. Furthermore, multilateral institutions such as the IMF, the World Bank or the WTO might give way to regional organisations. For example, Europe and East Asia would each step forward to fill the vacuum left by Washington’s withering leadership to pursue their own visions of regional political and economic orders. Free markets would become more politicised — and, well, less free — and major powers would compete for supremacy. Additionally, such power plays have historically possessed a zero-sum element. In the late 1960s and 1970s, US economic power declined relative to the rise of the Japanese and Western European economies, with the US dollar also becoming less attractive. And, as American power eroded, so did international regimes (such as the Bretton Woods System in 1973). A world without American hegemony is one where great power wars re-emerge, the liberal international system is supplanted by an authoritarian one, and trade protectionism devolves into restrictive, anti-globalisation barriers. This, at least, is one possibility we can forecast in a future that will inevitably be devoid of unrivalled US primacy.
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#### Collapse of international trade provokes war with Russia and China

Stewart Patrick, senior fellow and director of the Program on International Institutions and Global Governance at the Council on Foreign Relations, 3-13, 2009, "Protecting Free Trade," The National Interest, online: <http://www.nationalinterest.org/Article.aspx?id=21084>

President Obama has committed to working with U.S. trade partners to avoid “escalating protectionism.” He is wise to do so. As never before, U.S. **national security requires** a commitment to **open trade.** President Obama and his foreign counterparts should reflect on the lessons of the 1930s—and the insights of Cordell Hull. The longest-serving secretary of state in American history (1933–1944), Hull helped guide the United States through the Depression and World War II. He also understood a fundamental truth: “When goods move, soldiers don’t.” In the 1930s, global recession had catastrophic political consequences—in part because policymakers took exactly the wrong approach. Starting with America’s own Smoot Hawley Tariff of 1930, the world’s major trading nations tried to insulate themselves by adopting inward looking protectionist and discriminatory policies. The result was a vicious, self-defeating cycle of tit-for-tat retaliation. As states took refuge in prohibitive tariffs, import quotas, export subsidies and competitive devaluations, international commerce devolved into a desperate competition for dwindling markets. Between 1929 and 1933, the value of world trade plummeted from $50 billion to $15 billion. Global economic activity went into a death spiral, exacerbating the depth and length of the Great Depression. The economic consequences of protectionism were bad enough. The political consequences were worse. As Hull recognized, global economic fragmentation lowered standards of living, drove unemployment higher and increased poverty—accentuating social upheaval and leaving destitute populations “easy prey to dictators and desperadoes.” The rise of Nazism in Germany, fascism in Italy and militarism in Japan is impossible to divorce from the economic turmoil, which allowed demagogic leaders to mobilize support among alienated masses nursing nationalist grievances. Open **economic warfare poisoned the diplomatic climate and exacerbated great power rivalries**, raising, in Hull’s view, “constant temptation to use force, or threat of force, to obtain what could have been got through normal processes of trade.” Assistant Secretary William Clayton agreed: “Nations which act as enemies in the marketplace cannot long be friends at the council table.” This is what makes growing protectionism and discrimination among the world’s major trading powers today so alarming. In 2008 world trade declined for the first time since 1982. And despite their pledges, seventeen G-20 members have adopted significant trade restrictions. “Buy American” provisions in the U.S. stimulus package have been matched by similar measures elsewhere, with the EU ambassador to Washington declaring that “Nobody will take this lying down.” Brussels has resumed export subsidies to EU dairy farmers and restricted imports from the United States and China. Meanwhile, India is threatening new tariffs on steel imports and cars; Russia has enacted some thirty new tariffs and export subsidies. In a sign of the global mood, WTO antidumping cases are up 40 percent since last year. Even less blatant forms of economic nationalism, such as banks restricting lending to “safer” domestic companies, risk shutting down global capital flows and exacerbating the current crisis. If unchecked, such economic nationalism could **raise diplomatic tensions among the world’s major powers**. At particular risk are U.S. relations with China, Washington’s most important bilateral interlocutor in the twenty-first century. China has called the “Buy American” provisions “poison”—not exactly how the Obama administration wants to start off the relationship. U.S. Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner’s ill-timed comments about China’s currency “manipulation” and his promise of an “aggressive” U.S. response were not especially helpful either, nor is Congress’ preoccupation with “unfair” Chinese trade and currency practices. For its part, Beijing has responded to the global slump by rolling back some of the liberalizing reforms introduced over the past thirty years. Such practices, including state subsidies, collide with the spirit and sometimes the law of open trade. The Obama administration must find common ground with Beijing on a coordinated response, or risk retaliatory protectionism that could **severely damage both economies and escalate into political confrontation.** A trade war is the last thing the United States needs, given that China holds $1 trillion of our debt and will be critical to solving flashpoints ranging from **Iran to North Korea.** In the 1930s, authoritarian great-power governments responded to the global downturn by adopting more nationalistic and aggressive policies. Today, the economic crisis may well fuel rising nationalism and regional assertiveness in emerging countries. Russia is a case in point. Although some predict that the economic crisis will temper Moscow’s international ambitions, evidence for such geopolitical modesty is slim to date. Neither the collapse of its stock market nor the decline in oil prices has kept Russia from flexing its muscles from Ukraine to Kyrgyzstan. While some expect the economic crisis to challenge Putin’s grip on power, there is no guarantee that Washington will find any successor regime less nationalistic and aggressive. Beyond generating great power antagonism, misguided protectionism could also **exacerbate political upheaval** in the developing world. As Director of National Intelligence Dennis Blair recently testified, the downturn has already aggravated political instability in a quarter of the world’s nations. In many emerging countries, including important players like South Africa, Ukraine and **Mexico, political stability rests on a precarious balance.** Protectionist policies could well push developing economies and emerging market exporters over the edge. In Pakistan, a protracted economic crisis could precipitate the **collapse of the regime** and fragmentation of the state. No surprise, then, that President Obama is the first U.S. president to receive a daily economic intelligence briefing, distilling the security implications of the global crisis.
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#### Primacy key to the global spread of democracy

Robert Kagan, senior fellow in foreign policy at the Brookings Institution, 2/11/2012, “Why the World Needs America,” Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203646004577213262856669448.html

If all of this sounds too good to be true, it is. The present world order was largely shaped by American power and reflects American interests and preferences. If the balance of power shifts in the direction of other nations, the world order will change to suit their interests and preferences. Nor can we assume that all the great powers in a post-American world would agree on the benefits of preserving the present order, or have the capacity to preserve it, even if they wanted to. Take the issue of democracy. For several decades, the balance of power in the world has favored democratic governments. In a genuinely post-American world, the balance would shift toward the great-power autocracies. Both Beijing and Moscow already protect dictators like Syria's Bashar al-Assad. If they gain greater relative influence in the future, we will see fewer democratic transitions and more autocrats hanging on to power. The balance in a new, multipolar world might be more favorable to democracy if some of the rising democracies—Brazil, India, Turkey, South Africa—picked up the slack from a declining U.S. Yet not all of them have the desire or the capacity to do it.

#### Global democracy key to prevent extinction.

Larry Diamond, Senior Fellow at the Hoover Institution, December 1995, Promoting Democracy in the 1990s, , http://www.wilsoncenter.org/subsites/ccpdc/pubs/di/1.htm.

This hardly exhausts the lists of threats to our security and well-being in the coming years and decades. In the former Yugoslavia nationalist aggression tears at the stability of Europe and could easily spread. The flow of illegal drugs intensifies through increasingly powerful international crime syndicates that have made common cause with authoritarian regimes and have utterly corrupted the institutions of tenuous, democratic ones. Nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons continue to proliferate. The very source of life on Earth, the global ecosystem, appears increasingly endangered. Most of these new and unconventional threats to security are associated with or aggravated by the weakness or absence of democracy, with its provisions for legality, accountability, popular sovereignty, and openness. LESSONS OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY The experience of this century offers important lessons. Countries that govern themselves in a truly democratic fashion do not go to war with one another. They do not aggress against their neighbors to aggrandize themselves or glorify their leaders. Democratic governments do not ethnically "cleanse" their own populations, and they are much less likely to face ethnic insurgency. Democracies do not sponsor terrorism against one another. They do not build weapons of mass destruction to use on or to threaten one another. Democratic countries form more reliable, open, and enduring trading partnerships. In the long run they offer better and more stable climates for investment. They are more environmentally responsible because they must answer to their own citizens, who organize to protest the destruction of their environments. They are better bets to honor international treaties since they value legal obligations and because their openness makes it much more difficult to breach agreements in secret. Precisely because, within their own borders, they respect competition, civil liberties, property rights, and the rule of law, democracies are the only reliable foundation on which a new world order of international security and prosperity can be built.
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#### Plan: The United States Federal Government should substantially increase investment to rebuild and modernize the Interstate highway system

#### Observation two is solvency:

Increased investment in the Interstate Highway system key to maintain mobility and decrease congestion  
Robert Poole, Director of transportation policy at Reason Foundation, August 2010, “Restoring Trust in the Highway Trust Fund,” reason.org/files/restoring\_highway\_trust\_fund.pdf

There are five fundamental reasons why America must continue large-scale capital investments in its highway system. First, highways and bridges wear out over time, yet limited preservation investment in recent decades has allowed the accumulation of huge backlogs of deferred maintenance and rehabilitation, leading to faster deterioration. Second, when highways and bridges do wear out they must be replaced; much of the Interstate system will be in this situation in the next two decades. And the cost of replacement, 50 years after original construction, is many times that original cost. Third, the places where Americans live and work have changed dramatically since the Interstate system was planned in the 1940s; hence, some new highways are needed to connect places that scarcely existed 70 years ago (e.g., the missing Interstate link between Phoenix and Las Vegas). Fourth, given the enormous growth in both population and affluence since the 1950s, significant portions of our major highways are under-sized for current, let alone future, travel demand. Improved performance (e.g., reduced congestion) therefore requires additional capacity. Fifth, Americans continue to consume more, and goods move in this country mainly by roads. Almost 70% (by weight) of domestic freight moves by truck. And a great deal of the freight moved primarily by rail also moves by truck for part of its journey. Continuing to move more goods more quickly will require better performing roads.

### Highways 1AC 10/10

#### The Federal role is key - Interstate travel means that only the Federal government can effectively rebuild the Interstate Highway system

Robert Poole, Director of transportation policy at Reason Foundation, August 2010, “Restoring Trust in the Highway Trust Fund,” reason.org/files/restoring\_highway\_trust\_fund.pdf This study argues that the federal program needs to be rethought. The federal transportation program is notoriously politicized, failing to make the best use of existing funds and failing to focus on the most important national transportation goals. Every serious study in recent years has concluded that America is under-investing in highway infrastructure; indeed, we are not even investing enough to maintain its current mediocre performance and condition, let alone enough to produce major improvements. But rather than simply putting larger sums of money into a seriously flawed process, the better course is to rethink and refocus the federal role, in order to spend more on core federal purposes and less on peripheral concerns. Some reauthorizations have brought big changes to the federal transportation program. This one should as well, not by moving further away from a user-fee funded system designed to improve mobility, but by moving back toward it. While the federal government may have an interest in a wide range of transportation issues and concerns, direct federal involvement is both unwise and inappropriate in many of these areas. The facilitation of inter-state travel and commerce and international trade are clearly federal responsibilities, so a larger emphasis on inter-state and international transportation should be at the core of a rethought federal role. The Interstate highway system was laid out more than 60 years ago, and begun 50 years ago. Increasing portions of it are reaching the end of their design life and need complete reconstruction. Most urban Interstates need major additions to eliminate bottlenecks and reduce congestion, and as the lifeblood of goods movement, many inter-city Interstates need more lanes to handle projected growth in truck traffic. A major federal effort to rebuild and modernize the Interstate system for the 21st century (Interstate 2.0) would give new focus to the federal highway program. It offers the opportunity to restore the original user-fee nature of highway user taxes. Ever since the ISTEA legislation of 1991, each federal reauthorization has expanded the eligible uses of federal highway user taxes to an ever- larger array of non-highway programs. Indeed, this diversion ultimately goes back to the 1970 PL 91-605, which first permitted Highway Trust Fund monies to be used for transit facilities, undercutting the users-pay/users-benefit principle. Subsequent reauthorizations steadily increased non-highway uses, such that today urban transit, bikeways, scenic trails, “enhancements,” and numerous other programs consume about one-quarter of all current federal highway user tax revenues.

#### Root cause analysis is misguided – there’s no feasible replacement for highways and expansion will create improvements even if it’s not perfect

Brian Taylor, Associate Professor of Urban Planning and Director of the Institute of Transportation Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles, Fall 2002, “Rethinking Traffic Congestion,” Access, Number 21, Pg. 13

When capacity is expanded on heavily used roads, reduced delay can prove fleeting. This leads some observers to conclude that widening roads is a waste of time and money. Others go further, claiming that it makes things worse, since more people are delayed and more emissions are produced after the expanded facility fills up again with traffic. Some have likened it to buying a bigger belt to address the problem of weight gain. But this analogy is misleading because it treats travel as simply a bad habit, and ignores the role of mobility in facilitating social interactions and economic transactions. While capacity expansion in areas of dense activity may fail to eliminate congestion, it may still bring significant social and economic benefit by accommodating more activity.

### IHS Funding Low Now

#### Status quo funding inadequate to maintain the Interstate Highway system

Chad Shirley, Deputy Assistant Director at Congressional Budget Office, January 2011, “Spending and Funding for Highways,” pg. 1

One approach is to base future spending on existing amounts, such as maintaining the same spending either with or without adjusting for the effects of inflation. Total federal spending on highway infrastructure for 2009 amounted to $41 billion (see Figure 1); of that amount, $39 billion was for capital projects, and $2 billion was for operations and maintenance. Real (that is, inflation-adjusted) government spending for highway construction has increased, on balance, during the past 30 years. However, such spending declined in the middle of the 2000s, when the cost of materials used to build highways increased sharply because of increases in U.S. demand arising from residential and commercial con- struction and in worldwide demand from countries such as China. Going forward, capital spending could be indexed to the costs of highway construction or to overall prices in the economy. However, if existing levels of inflation-adjusted spending were maintained over decades, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) estimates that the performance and quality of the high- way system would decline—with increases in delays caused by traffic congestion and increases in the amount of travel on roads with pavement of less than acceptable quality.

#### Current highway funding is through temporary extensions – long term funding is key to solve

Andrew Gillman, Director of Public Relations and Performance Marketing at the Road Connection,2/27/2012, “The Future of the U.S. Highway System: A look into the grave situation facing our roadways,” http://www.forconstructionpros.com/whitepaper/10634303/the-future-of-the-us-highway-system

The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (commonly referred to as SAFETEA-­‐LU), was a funding authorization bill signed into law by President George W. Bush in 2005. The bill provided $286.4 Billion to improve and maintain surface transportation in the United States, with a large portion of that amount going towards the country’s interstates. The law expired on September 30, 2009, and since that time, Congress has been bumping along with a series of extensions. Since it’s expiration, Congress has extended SAFETEA-­‐LU a total of eight times, with the last extension set to expire March 31, 2012. Congressman John Mica, (R-­‐FL), Chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee supports a long-­‐term version of SAFETEA-­‐ LU as opposed to a series of extensions. “Nothing is going to put people to work like a major transportation bill for this country,” he adds. Many transportation experts also agree with Congressman Mica that a long-­‐ term bill needs to be passed to go towards fixing the National Interstate System, and spurring job creation in the United States. The Catch-­‐22 in this situation however, is that without the extensions, many road and bridge infrastructure projects would come to a complete halt. Extensions are not the ideal situation under which to work, so the hope for many in the industry remains that Congress and the President can work together to nail down a multi-­‐year, long-­‐term bill before the next extension expires.

#### IHS Funding shortfalls inevitable in the status quo

National Chamber Foundation, 2005, “Future Highway and Public Transportation Financing,” pg. 1

Current revenues provided by all levels of government—federal, state, and local—are neither sufficient to maintain the condition and performance of the nation’s highway and transit systems nor to improve the condition and performance of these systems to levels that best serve the nation’s economy. To maintain our current transportation system, all levels of government must invest $235 billion in 2006, $304 billion in 2015, and $472 billion in 2030.1 Current revenue streams will fall far short of these levels—there will be a cumulative shortfall through 2015 is $0.5 trillion.2 “Maintain” means that pavement and bridge conditions and traffic levels of service remain the same, on average. Below this level, conditions will deteriorate, and congestion will grow.

### IHS Funding Low Now

#### Not enough Federal funds to maintain or improve Interstate Highways

National Chamber Foundation, 2005, “Future Highway and Public Transportation Financing,” pg. 1

If these federal shares are to be sustained, the federal government must provide $58 billion of the $135 billion in capital investment needed in 2006 to maintain the condition and performance of the nation’s highway and transit systems and $80 billion of the $187 billion needed to improve the systems. By 2015, the federal share of the average annual capital investment needed to maintain the highway and transit systems is $64 billion and the federal share to improve is $89 billion. These needs are $23 billion and $48 billion more, respectively, than the average annual federal revenue of $41 billion. Under the current federal revenue structure and motor fuel tax rates, these revenue shortfalls will continue through 2030.

#### Status quo funding insufficient to maintain the IHS

Chicago Tribune, 6/26/2006, "Marking 50 years of fast roads," articles.chicagotribune.com/2006-06-26/news/0606260123\_1\_highway-system-highway-network-roads

"One of the great holes in American transportation funding is that there is no systematic program to renew the interstate highways," said David Schulz, executive director of the Infrastructure and Technology Institute at Northwestern University. "No one even pretends that the $286 billion in the current federal transportation funding bill is sufficient to simply maintain the current system," Schulz said. "The 50th anniversary of the interstate system would be a good time to confront the reality that we must find more money to pay for roads and transit in the U.S."

#### Insufficient funding for the IHS in the status quo

Chicago Tribune, 6/26/2006, "Marking 50 years of fast roads," articles.chicagotribune.com/2006-06-26/news/0606260123\_1\_highway-system-highway-network-roads

Even with increases in the federal gas tax and the imposition of state and local motor fuel taxes, the need for better roads and mass-transit services far outstrips the available funding. Government auditors warn that the federal Highway Trust Fund, which pays for a big part of highway construction and maintenance, transit infrastructure projects and transportation safety projects, could run out of money by 2009.

### IHS Deterioration Now

#### The highways are falling apart – the IHS is more than 50 years old

David Levinson, Associate Professor in the Department of Civil Engineering at the University of Minnesota February 2011, “Fix It First, Expand It Second, Reward It Third: A New Strategy for America’s Highways,” pg. 5

More than five decades ago, the federal government built an excellent interstate highway network that connects all large metropolitan areas, ports, and airports within the contiguous United States. This network that connects places is foremost a network that connects people: it allows people (and firms) to interact, creating opportunities for trade and economic activity. Places that have the greatest accessibility, that enable more people to interact in less time, produce the greatest wealth (Glaeser 1998). Workers face less risk of unemployment in cities where they can easily commute to many possible employment centers. These economies of agglomeration drive the formation of cities and regions, and require transportation of all kinds: passenger and freight; local and intercity; highway and transit; and rail, air, and water. Transportation infrastructure is crucial for facilitating trade within, between, and across states. In addition, this infrastructure is a crucial determinant of quality-of-life issues, including the length of our commutes, the quality of our air, and the livability of our neighborhoods. Unfortunately, we fail to realize the full benefit of our system of infrastructure and risk losing what we have because we are not investing enough to maintain aging bridges and highways and because we do not use the system as efficiently as we could. The existing transportation network represents long- lived capital: highways, bridges, and tunnels last for decades. Moreover, much of our existing highway network was built many years ago. For example, the average age of a bridge on the U.S. Interstate Highway system is more than forty-five years old; most bridges were designed for a lifespan of forty to fifty years. Over time, infrastructure deteriorates. Most of the time this deterioration is unheeded, but salient disasters remind us of the importance of updating aging infrastructure. The fatal collapse of the I-35W Mississippi River Bridge in Minneapolis brought needed attention to the question of the state of repair of America’s bridges. Roads have similar, though not nearly as dramatic, issues: poor roads impose wear and tear costs on vehicles, can lead to accidents, and require further costs in packaging to avoid damaged freight.

#### The IHS is too old to meet 21st century demands

AASHTO, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, February 2007, “TRANSPORTATION INVEST IN OUR FUTURE,” www.transportation1.org/tif1report/TIF1-1.pdf

These trends are fundamental, they are inexorable, and they are escalating. These are the trends that create 21st Century challenges that were unheard of in the 1950s—the last time the United States set a new national transportation challenge. Then, the Interstate Highway Act envisioned a nation united with a new transcontinental highway network. Now, the U.S. needs to be united with a seamless and flexible system of modes to accommodate the frenetic and competitive global marketplace.

#### The IHS is old and falling apart

Chicago Tribune, 6/26/2006, "Marking 50 years of fast roads," articles.chicagotribune.com/2006-06-26/news/0606260123\_1\_highway-system-highway-network-roads

Yet today, experts see a 50-year-old highway system that is entering a mid-life crisis caused by previously unimaginable traffic congestion, inadequate funding for states and cities to build their way out of gridlock and an absence of policies and planning to balance the major modes of ground transportation: roads, mass transit and intercity passenger rail.

### IHS Traffic Increasing

#### Traffic demands for the HIS are increasing – economic growth

AASHTO, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, February 2007, “TRANSPORTATION INVEST IN OUR FUTURE,” www.transportation1.org/tif1report/TIF1-1.pdf

It is a surprising fact that traffic volumes and particularly freight volumes are growing much faster than the U.S. population, or even the U.S. Gross National Product. Several fundamental and powerful forces underlie this trend. First, traffic volumes and freight movement rise with economic growth. As affluence increases, so does travel. Likewise, rising affluence means rising consumption. As the economy grows, more goods are consumed. Goods must move along complex supply chains that originate with raw commodities, move to various value-added manufacturing processes and ultimately to warehouses and stores and to the doorstep of the American consumer. As the economy grows, so does the volume of goods shipped.

#### Outsourcing has shifted not ended manufacturing – IHS key to shipping

AASHTO, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, February 2007, “TRANSPORTATION INVEST IN OUR FUTURE,” www.transportation1.org/tif1report/TIF1-1.pdf

Secondly, despite a decline in manufacturing employment, manufacturing output continues to grow. American manufacturing is increasingly relying on high-end, high-value products to differentiate itself from growing foreign manufacturers who focus upon high-volume but lower-value products. America’s high-end manufactured goods need to travel great distances just to reach consumers in our own country, much less the thousands of miles to reach export markets. The populations and economies of Asia represent the most significant source of American exporting growth. This growth means American manufacturers are relying on our highways, railroads, water ports, and airports to be their conduit to these foreign customers—as well as to the traditional domestic ones.

#### Just-in-time logistics have increased highway shipping

AASHTO, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, February 2007, “TRANSPORTATION INVEST IN OUR FUTURE,” www.transportation1.org/tif1report/TIF1-1.pdf

Third, shipments are growing because of the efficiency of America’s just-in-time strategies. A significant portion of America’s productivity gains in recent years have come from logistics. As producers learned to lower costs by reducing inventory, the need for high-value, time-sensitive shipments has grown geometrically. American producers and consumers now demand a precisely tuned and reliable logistics network to provide what they want, when they want it. This applies to fresh produce in a Minnesota supermarket during February as well as to auto parts for a Detroit assembly line at the start of a production shift. A just-in-time economy means there are more shipments, generally of lower weight but of higher value, than in the past. The just-in-time logistics strategy has created some of the largest and most influential new American companies. Amazon could not exist without an instantaneous supply chain. Wal- Mart revolutionized retailing with its just-in-time inventories. Dell Computers eliminates stores by having consumers design computers on-line which are then delivered within hours. The profound influence of just-in-time practices created new economic models but also profoundly stressed America’s transportation network.

### IHS Key to the Economy

#### Highways key to the economy – they are vital commercial infrastructure

Chad Shirley, Deputy Assistant Director at Congressional Budget Office, January 2011, “Spending and Funding for Highways,” pg. 1

The nation’s network of highways plays a vital role in the U.S. economy; private commercial activity and people’s daily lives depend on that transportation infrastructure. In 2007, the public sector spent $146 billion to build, operate, and maintain highways in the United States. About three-quarters of that total was provided by state and local governments. One-quarter was provided by the federal government, primarily through the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU). The initial authorization for that law has expired; as the Congress considers the future role of the federal government in providing highway infrastructure, it faces three important questions: how to structure decisionmaking about high- way projects, how much money to spend on highways, and how to pay for that spending.

#### IHS key to the economy – it carries 42% of all traffic and 75% of truck traffic

National Chamber Foundation, 2005, “Future Highway and Public Transportation Financing,” pg. 1

The federal government provides funds to states and cities for capital improvements for highway and transit systems. The states and cities cover most of the cost of operating the highway and transit systems. Over the past 10 years, the federal share of annual capital investment by all levels of government in highways has averaged 42%. The federal share of public transit capital investment by all levels of government has averaged 47%. Most federal highway funds are spent on interstate highways and on other roads in the National Highway System (NHS), which carry 42% of all traffic and 75% of truck traffic. The NHS is critical to the nation’s economic well-being. The federal transit investment provides an important mobility option, particularly in congested metropolitan areas.

#### Enhancing the IHS key to meet rising trade demands needed for economic growth

AASHTO, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, February 2007, “TRANSPORTATION INVEST IN OUR FUTURE,” www.transportation1.org/tif1report/TIF1-1.pdf

The stereotype of the American economy is one of declining Rust Belt towns, booming service industries and stagnant rural farm communities. With such a stereotype, one may believe that overall travel and trade will grow slowly. To the contrary, the real American economy demands increasing volumes of trade if it is to continue to grow. The economic sectors that remain robust will require far more trade and travel per unit of output than was required 30 years ago.

### IHS Key to the Economy

#### IHS disrepair threatening economic growtt

John Schoen, Senior producer at MSNBC.com, 8/3/2007, “U.S. highway system badly in need of repair,” http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/20095291/ns/business-eye\_on\_the\_economy/t/us-highway-system-badly-need-repair/#.T8cEsb-kTjE

Apart from the threat to public safety, crumbling roadways and bridges are taking a toll on the nation's economy. About three-quarters of the $8.4 trillion worth of commodities delivered each year nationwide is carried by trucks; delays in that supply chain reduce the productivity of American businesses. At the same time motorists spend 3.7 billion hours a year stuck in traffic at a cost of $63 billion in wasted time and fuel costs, according to TRIP.

#### Multiple studies demonstrate IHS economic importance

AASHTO, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, 2006, “THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF THE INTERSTATE HIGHWAY SYSTEM,” pg.44

The economic impacts of the Interstate Highway System have been assessed through many previous studies, of which the most important and/or representative are highlighted in this white paper. The economic impact literature supports a strong conclusion that the development of the Interstate Highway System has had significant positive impacts on the nation’s economic performance since 1956. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) utilizes a formal highway investment model, the Highway Economic Requirements System (HERS) to estimate the direct economic impacts of alternative levels of investment in capacity enhancements, operations enhancements, and pavement rehabilitations. Likewise, FHWA has a formal bridge benefit cost model, the National Bridge Investment Analysis System (NBIAS), to perform similar analyses for bridges on the existing system, including bridges on the Interstate System. These models and others are adequate to estimate the direct economic impacts of improvements to the existing Interstate Highway System highways and bridges, and these models will be utilized in the latter tasks of this study for the purpose of direct economic analysis, including the identification of needed investment levels. But these models, because they are oriented to analyzing incremental changes to existing highways and bridges, do not even begin to capture what the full economic impact was of the development of the Interstate Highway System. Some of the broader economic analyses, such as Nadiri and Mamuneas and others, do quantify the full economic impacts, but may not fully explain the reasons why such large benefits were achieved.

#### Highways key to the economy

Russell Nichols, GOVERNING staff writer, June 2011, “Six Ideas for Fixing the Nation's Infrastructure Problems,” http://www.governing.com/topics/transportation-infrastructure/six-ideas-for-fixing-the-nations-infrastructure-problems.html

Highways in rural states play a critical role in the country’s economy: They connect to Western ports to facilitate the transport of goods, and they serve as interstate bridges for agriculture, energy and freight industries. But with national transportation planning often focused on urban development, rural highways can get neglected, leading to stretched capacity, reduced connectivity and strained two-lane roads used by heavy trucks. Mass transit in rural areas is even more problematic. In 2010, 8.9 million rural residents lacked access to intercity transportation by air, bus, ferry or rail, up from 5.4 million in 2005, according to a report from the Department of Transportation’s Bureau of Transportation Statistics. Alabama had the steepest drop: Nearly 700,000 rural residents lost access between 2005 and 2010.

### Congestion High Now

#### IHS deterioration causing a congestion crisis

AASHTO, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, February 2007, “TRANSPORTATION INVEST IN OUR FUTURE,” www.transportation1.org/tif1report/TIF1-1.pdf

The foundations of this congestion crisis are built upon the aging transportation network that serves the United States today: The Interstate Highway System was the envy of the world—in 1967. Today it is overwhelmed with traffic and truck volumes that far surpass anything anticipated when it was constructed. The Interstate Highway System was planned in the 1950s for the traffic volumes of the 1980s. Today, truck and traffic congestion is a daily occurrence which will grow to staggering rates in the next 20 years.

#### Congestion is rising – creates barriers to internal and international trade

AASHTO, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, February 2007, “TRANSPORTATION INVEST IN OUR FUTURE,” www.transportation1.org/tif1report/TIF1-1.pdf

As trade barriers fall around the world, a new trade barrier is rising around the American continent. Congestion at the nation’s ports, on its highways, and along its railroads is becoming the new tariff of the 21st Century. This congestion increases travel times, it disrupts tightly planned supply chains, and it raises the costs of doing business with America and in America. The effect of rising congestion is like a tax—only it escalates every year without a vote of the people. This congestion tax can be repealed only if the United States adopts a new vision and new strategy for a global, 21st Century American transportation system.

#### Congestion is a significant problem – recent reductions were only because of the recession

David Schrank, Associate Research Scientist at the Texas Transportation Institute, September 2011, URBAN MOBILITY REPORT, tti.tamu.edu/documents/mobility-report-2011.pdf

Congestion is a significant problem in America’s 439 urban areas. And, although readers and policy makers may have been distracted by the economy-based congestion reductions in the last few years, the 2010 data indicate the problem will not go away by itself – action is needed.

### Congestion High Now

#### Congestion is a huge problem now

David Schrank, Associate Research Scientist at the Texas Transportation Institute, September 2011, URBAN MOBILITY REPORT, tti.tamu.edu/documents/mobility-report-2011.pdf

First, the problem is very large. In 2010, congestion caused urban Americans to travel 4.8 billion hours more and to purchase an extra 1.9 billion gallons of fuel for a congestion cost of $101 billion. (see Exhibit 1) Second, 2008 was the best year for congestion in recent times (see Exhibit 2); congestion was worse in 2009 and 2010. Third, there is only a short-term cause for celebration. Prior to the economy slowing, just 4 years ago, congestion levels were much higher than a decade ago; these conditions will return with a strengthening economy

#### Highways suffer from massive congestion

Randal O’Toole, Senior fellow with the Cato Institute, 5/15/2012, “Ending Congestion by Refinancing Highways,” www.cato.org/pubs/pas/PA695.pdf

America’s highway network was once the envy of the world, but today much of it suffers from terrible traffic congestion. According to the Texas Transportation Institute (TTI), the monetized cost of urban congestion quintupled between 1982 and 2007, and though it declined slightly since then due to the recession, it is still more than $100 billion a year. Moreover, the TTI urban mobility report only counts some congestion costs; the total cost is likely closer to $200 billion.

#### Congestion will return as economic growth continues

David Schrank, Associate Research Scientist at the Texas Transportation Institute, September 2011, URBAN MOBILITY REPORT, tti.tamu.edu/documents/mobility-report-2011.pdf

The economic recession has only provided a temporary respite from the growing congestion problem. When the economic growth returns, the average commuter is estimated to see an additional 3 hours of delay by 2015 and 7 hours by 2020. By 2015, the cost of gridlock will rise from $101 billion to $133 billion – more than $900 for every commuter, and the amount of wasted fuel will jump from 1.9 billion gallons to 2.5 billion gallons – enough to fill more than 275,000 gasoline tanker trucks.

### Congestion Impact – Economy

#### Congestion is one of the largest threats to the economy

AASHTO, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, February 2007, “TRANSPORTATION INVEST IN OUR FUTURE,” www.transportation1.org/tif1report/TIF1-1.pdf

Congestion is one of the single largest threats to our economic prosperity and way of life. Whether it takes the form of trucks stalled in traffic, cargo stuck at overwhelmed seaports, or airplanes circling over crowded airports, congestion is costing America an estimated $200 billion a year. Each year, Americans lose 3.7 billion hours and 2.3 billion gallons of fuel sitting in traffic jams and waste $9.4 billion as a result of airline delays. Worse, congestion is affecting the quality of Americans’ lives by robbing them of time that could be spent with families and friends.

#### Congestion undermines the economy by increasing shipping costs and wasting time

PR Newswire, 5/7/2001, Increased Traffic Congestion Threatens to Put the Brakes On Nation's Economic Growth, Research Group Reports, http://article.wn.com/view/2001/05/07/Increased\_Traffic\_Congestion\_Threatens\_to\_Put\_the\_Brakes\_On\_/

Increasing traffic congestion is becoming more costly to individuals and threatens to slow the nation's continued economic growth in the years ahead, a nonprofit transportation research group reported today. The Road Information Program (TRIP) today issued its report, "Stuck in Traffic," showing that growing levels of traffic congestion could hamper the nation's economic prosperity and result in higher costs to consumers because of increased shipping costs and higher costs to motorists because of wasted time and fuel while stuck in traffic. "Increasing traffic congestion nationwide threatens to put the brakes on the nation's economic growth," said William M. Wilkins, TRIP executive director. "The high quality of life that Americans enjoy today increasingly is jeopardized because our highway system is inadequate to meet the growing need for the reliable movement of goods." Wilkins pointed out that the American way of life depends on the ability of a transportation system to move goods and services in a timely, cost- effective way, but increased levels of traffic congestion result in costly delays. " Traffic congestion slows the delivery of products and services that serve as the economic backbone of our nation," Wilkins said. "Increasing traffic congestion makes it more difficult and more expensive to move goods from manufacturing and service centers, ports and rail depots to the rest of the country."

#### Congestion causes massive economic damage

Walter Block, Professor Economics at Loyola University New Orleans, 2009, “The Privatization of Roads and Highways,” pg. 47

Traffic congestion is one of the most stultifying, annoying and petty occurrences known to mankind. Vehicles which are capable of safely covering 150 mph under specialized conditions, and 55 mph under normal conditions, are limited to crawling along, bumper-to-bumper, at perhaps 5 mph. Congestion is a danger to motorists. Apart from the direct psychological buffeting, frayed tempers undoubtedly create traf- fic accidents. The vehicle, too, deteriorates at a faster rate than otherwise, and overheated engines, cooling systems, interior hoses, etc., are the cause of yet additional highway injury and death. The economic losses are monumental, merely in terms of wasted time. A system more wasteful of manpower can hardly be imagined: thousands upon thousands of productive workers are forced to sit idle in many cases for ninety minutes in the morning rush hour, and another ninety minutes in the evening. Furthermore, there is the spectacle of millions of vehicles, standing virtually still, with their motors idling and using up scarce gasoline supplies, while the society at large calls in vain for oil and gas conservation. Nor is congestion a phenomenon limited to the process of getting to and from work. In many large cities, practically anything out of the ordinary is sufficient to trigger it: the letting out of the opera, a movie, or a ball game; the attempt to go to or return from the beach, the golf course or shopping. Traffic congestion reaches into all aspects of living: working, shopping, recreation, etc. It insidiously cripples the ability of people to coordinate activities with one another, as it becomes virtually impossible to make exact appointments—a broad interval of time is usually the best that can be planned on. One superficial indication of the gravity of the situation is the dramatic language used to describe it in otherwise sober and unemotional scholarly works. A.A. Walters, for example, in an authoritative mathematical and analytical tome, is moved to characterize “the congestion of towns and cities” as no less than “the plague of the century.”

### IHS Key to the Military

#### IHS mobility is key to STRAHNET – a critical military mobilization network necessary for deterrence

John Pike, Director of GlobalSecurity.org, 5/7/2011, "Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET)," www.globalsecurity.org/military/facility/strahnet.htm

The Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET) system of public highways provides access, continuity, and emergency transportation of personnel and equipment in times of peace and war. The 61,000-mile system, designated by the Federal Highway Administration in partnership with DOD, comprises about 45,400 miles of Interstate and defense highways and 15,600 miles of other public highways. STRAHNET is complemented by about 1,700 miles of connectors-additional highway routes linking more than 200 military installations and ports to the network. The Strategic Highway Network (STRAHNET) is a system of public highways that is a key deterrent in United States strategic policy. It provides defense access, continuity, and emergency capabilities for movements of personnel and equipment in both peace and war. Most large military convoys use the Strategic Highway Network. These routes connect military bases to the interstate highway network and include over 15,000 miles of roadway nationally. STRAHNET roadways are those which would be used for the rapid mobilization and deployment of armed forces in the event of war or peacekeeping activity.

#### Revitalized IHS key to military mobilization

Michael Bronzini, Professor Emeritus and Research Professor at George Mason University, 2011, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION: THE CASE FOR GROWTH, pg. 4

The highway system has a major role in national defense and homeland security. We sometimes overlook the fact that the official name of the interstate highway system is the “National System of Interstate and Defense Highways.” The defense benefits of the system became evident in the military mobilization leading up to Operation Desert Storm. Use of the highways for emergency evacuation and response has occurred with every recent hurricane, and is a major element of the emergency response plan of every metropolitan area.

#### Revitalized IHS key to meet military needs for rapid deployment

AASHTO, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, 2006, “THE INTERSTATE AND NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM- A BRIEF HISTORY AND LESSONS LEARNED,” pg. 40

The concept of STRAHNET, a system of roads important to national defense, goes back to World War I when trucks of newly standardized designs destined for France were driven overland from Ohio to New York City and Baltimore because of congestion on the railroads. Over 30,000 trucks traveled east via designated truck routes, each loaded with 3 tons or more of spare parts and munitions, releasing over 17,000 railcars for other work. During the WW I transportation crisis the federal government had seized the railroads and the newly formed state highway departments cooperated with the War Department to bring road resources to bear on the problem. Following the war the “Pershing Map” of 1922 defining military needs was produced in anticipation of the defining of first 7 percent highway system required by the Federal Highway Act of 1921. All of the routes on the Pershing map were incorporated into the first Federal-aid system. In 1935 BPR and the War Department restudied military highway needs working with the states. These updated needs were important in the selection of the 26,700 mile system recommended in the 1939 report Toll Roads and Free Roads. At the start of WW II the War Department brought the total mileage it considered important up to 74,600 miles of which 29,000 were considered critical. Bridges unable to support heavy military loads were of particular concern. The Defense Highway Act of 1941 provided some funds for military related highway needs and work on the 1400 mile Alaska Highway was begun. The war efforts resulted in serious deterioration of the nation’s highways. At the same time normal road programs ground to a halt with gas rationing drying up revenues and war efforts getting priorities for cement, steel and related materials. The same 1941 Defense Act provided $10 million for post war planning and it was this money that led to the Interregional Highways report of 1944 which recommended an “optimum” system of 33,920 miles or about 1 percent of the then total road and street mileage. (Note the precision!) The postwar highway bill that was enacted after 9 months of debate authorized a 40,000 mile National System of Interstate Highways. Military requirements have changed over the years. They have moved from the need for a paved load bearing system that accessed military facilities and ports, to a system that would transport the missiles of the Cold War era to finally today to the rapid deployment needs of the Iraq wars which stress high volume movements between bases, equipment and munitions manufacturers, and ports and airports. It is rather ironic to think that many highway histories have characterized the addition of the word Defense to the title of the Interstate System as a ploy to gain support, but the highway/defense connection has a long and continuing history. The most recent evolution is the importance being placed on military needs in the definition of intermodal connectors on the NHS system.

### Solvency – IHS Funding

#### Expanding funding for the IHS sustains economic growth and military primacy

Michael Bronzini, Professor Emeritus and Research Professor at George Mason University, 2011, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION: THE CASE FOR GROWTH, pg. 1

This paper reviews the history and background of the development of our surface transportation system, and the salient issues surrounding investment in the system. Surface transportation investments have demonstrable economic and social benefits that go well beyond the sums invested. These benefits include net increases in economic output and productivity, improved national security and disaster response, and equitable access to economic and social opportunities for our citizens. There is widespread consensus that public investments in surface transportation have been lagging needs for several decades, to the point where our crumbling and congested infrastructure threatens our economic and social well being and our competitiveness in world markets. While some gains can be made through better use of existing revenue, rehabilitating the existing system and investing in our future will require spending that is tens of $billions per year above recent levels. How to raise the required revenue is a more complex and controversial issue. Federal and state revenues are primarily derived from liquid fuel taxes, and the combined effects of greater vehicle fuel efficiency and the tax structure have severely eroded purchasing power in real dollar terms. Over the long term we must face up to the inevitable conclusion that the fuel taxes, by themselves, are not sustainable as our primary revenue source. The pending shortfall in the federal Highway Trust Fund has forced the issue. It is urgent that we get on with the process of identifying and analyzing acceptable alternative or supplemental funding methods.

#### New IHS reconstruction financing key to make necessary upgrades

Robert Poole, Director of transportation policy at Reason Foundation, 3/7/2011, “Interstate 2.0 Why fiscal conservatives should support rebuilding America’s federal highway system,” http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/interstate-20\_552551.html

There are three principal reasons for the disconnect between reality and much conservative thinking about Interstate highways. First, highways wear out. Major highways, such as urban freeways and our long-distance Interstates, are designed for a useful life of about 50 years, even with reasonably good maintenance. After that, they need to be rebuilt, from the sub-pavement base on up. And when such a road is reconstructed, it makes sense to upgrade its design to current standards, instead of the accepted practices of 50 years before. For example, many of the early freeways were designed with left-side exits at major interchanges, a practice now seen as creating safety hazards. The Interstate highway program began in 1956, with the initial segments opening in the late ’50s and early ’60s. That means large portions of the system will reach their 50th anniversary this decade and next. And that will mean major reconstruction projects, carried out at today’s high construction costs.

#### New IHS funding key to create new routes to important cities like Las Vegas and Phoenix that didn’t exist when it was built

Robert Poole, Director of transportation policy at Reason Foundation, 3/7/2011, “Interstate 2.0 Why fiscal conservatives should support rebuilding America’s federal highway system,” http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/interstate-20\_552551.html

Second, the map of what became the Interstate system was drawn up in the 1940s, for a country whose economy was predominantly industrial rather than services-based, and whose population was far more concentrated in the Northeast and Midwest than today’s. There is no Interstate route, for instance, between Las Vegas and Phoenix, two major and (for the past 40 years) rapidly growing metro areas. Patterns of shipping and travel have changed enormously over the decades, and accordingly there are many missing links in the Interstate system. Many of those links could be created by upgrading existing highways to Interstate standards. But the idea that “the Interstate system” is complete is fallacious.

### Solvency – IHS Funding

#### IHS funding key to widening and other capacity building projects that reduce congestion

Robert Poole, Director of transportation policy at Reason Foundation, 3/7/2011, “Interstate 2.0 Why fiscal conservatives should support rebuilding America’s federal highway system,” http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/interstate-20\_552551.html

Third, many of our Interstates​—​both urban and rural​—​are seriously congested and need more capacity. In some cases, this means widening them in the near term, well before age requires complete reconstruction. In other cases, adding lanes is appropriate when the facility is rebuilt, as when the old Woodrow Wilson Bridge was replaced several years ago on the Capital Beltway between Maryland and Virginia and when the obsolete Marquette Interchange was rebuilt in Milwaukee.

#### Increasing federal investment ensures the IHS can meet future demand

Robert Poole, Director of transportation policy at Reason Foundation, 3/7/2011, “Interstate 2.0 Why fiscal conservatives should support rebuilding America’s federal highway system,” http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/interstate-20\_552551.html

But the Interstate system is wearing out, much of its design is obsolete, and it is woefully short of the capacity needed to support projected population and economic growth in coming decades. Hence, it makes sense to re- focus the federal program on a second-generation Interstate system for the 21st century: Interstate 2.0. Much of the cost of this program will go for reconstruction and widening, as well as replacing obsolete interchanges conducive to bottlenecks. But the map also needs to be redrawn, reflecting where economic activity takes place today and tomorrow, not where it was in the 1940s. That will involve upgrading a number of highways in what is now called the National Highway System to full Interstate standards.

#### Only an increase in funds can prevent deteriorating IHS conditions

Robert Poole, Director of transportation policy at Reason Foundation, 3/7/2011, “Interstate 2.0 Why fiscal conservatives should support rebuilding America’s federal highway system,” http://www.weeklystandard.com/articles/interstate-20\_552551.html

What would it cost to reconstruct, expand, and modernize the Interstate system? One estimate comes from the Federal Highway Administration. Every two years FHWA is required to report to Congress on the condition and performance of the U.S. highway system. It estimates the amount of annual capital spending (major maintenance, reconstruction, and new capacity) required (1) to maintain current conditions (e.g., pavement quality) and performance (e.g., congestion) and (2) to improve conditions and performance (e.g., replace deficient bridges, significantly reduce congestion). Based on a requirement that such projects have a ratio of benefits to costs of at least 1.5, the average annual investment in the Interstate system to improve conditions was between $24 billion and $39 billion. Current annual capital investment in the Interstates (federal plus state) averages $16.5 billion. Thus, the annual shortfall is between $7.5 billion and $22.5 billion. To invest less than that means, at best, to preserve today’s conditions, including today’s level of congestion.

### Trade Deficit Add-On

#### Facilitating mobility for the manufacturing sector key to exports and reducing the trade deficit

AASHTO, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, February 2007, “TRANSPORTATION INVEST IN OUR FUTURE,” www.transportation1.org/tif1report/TIF1-1.pdf

Importantly, productivity gains from investment in technology and improvements in manufacturing processes will increase manufacturing output and generate more—not less—demand for transportation. The overall value of industrial production will grow faster than the overall economy. The manufacturing that remains in the United States will create high-end, high-value products, America’s exports of the future. Durable goods manufacturing, which includes automobiles, high-tech machinery and electronics, will see the greatest growth. These sectors will increase at a compound rate of 5.4 percent annually, compared to overall American economic growth of 2.8 percent. Traditional manufacturing will continue to grow at a respectable rate of 2.6 percent a year. The increase in American manufacturing output will be the country’s primary engine for exports. Such exports are sorely needed to combat America’s significant trade imbalance and to expand the markets for America’s best-paying employers.

#### Promoting transportation of agricultural goods key to exports

AASHTO, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, February 2007, “TRANSPORTATION INVEST IN OUR FUTURE,” www.transportation1.org/tif1report/TIF1-1.pdf

Agricultural products will continue to be another critical product which America wants to export. American farmers have learned that processing raw commodities into higher value products is a prime means of increasing value and exports. Converting raw milk into yogurt, converting soybeans into processed cattle feed, and turning corn into corn syrup adds value beyond what the original raw commodity would provide. Exports are critical to increasing markets for American farmers. In many Midwestern states, agricultural products are the first or second largest share of products moving on the freight networks. Trucks, railcars and barges all contribute to a network that moves bulk grain to processors where it is converted into value-added exports.

#### The trade deficit makes economic collapse inevitable

Weller, Senior Fellow at the Center for American Progress, February

2011, The Case for Strategic Export Promotion, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/02/pdf/high\_tech\_trade\_exec\_summ.pdf

The United States faces **enormous economic obstacles** in the immediate future as it recovers from the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression. The private-sector recovery is under way, with industrial production growing by 9.2 percent from June 2009 to July 2010, and with business investment up by an inflationadjusted 5.2 percent from June 2009 to June 2010. Private-sector employment is also on the rise with more than 1.1 million jobs created in 2010.1 This is good news, but **large challenges still loom** that could **derail** the fledgling private-sector momentum contributing to our economic recovery**. An important challenge is the trade deficit.** The U.S. trade deficit is widening again, reaching 3.7 percent of gross domestic product (the total amount of goods and services produced in our economy) in the third quarter of 2010, up from 2.4 percent of GDP in the second quarter of 2009. This widening gap poses **a drag on economic growth** since the country has to borrow money overseas to pay for the extra imports—a debt that ultimately will have to be repaid. A country can only import more than it exports if overseas investors lend it money. For the United States this means a persistent trade deficit requires taking on ever more foreign debt to pay for the excess of imports over exports. That’s why maintaining U.S. international economic competitiveness and strengthening our exports must be a key component of any serious strategy to produce sustained and long-term economic growth.

### Trade Deficit Add-On

#### The trade deficit will cause protectionist escalation – causes tit for tat trade war

Hufbauer, Senior Research Staff at Petereson Institute for International Economics, 2010

US Protectionist Impulses in the Wakeof the Great Recession, http://www.iie.com/publications/papers/hufbauer201003.pdf

The U.S. unemployment rate more than doubled between the onset of the Great Recession in December 2007 and December 2009, and is now hovering just below 10 percent (figure 1). Considering that this discouraging figure likely understates broader deterioration in the U.S. labor market, the absence of sustained Congressional pressure for large‐scale protectionist measures, beyond “Buy American” provisions and several smaller companions (all examined in this report), is in some ways surprising. At least part of the explanation for the restrained political response is the simultaneous large improvement in the U.S. trade balance during 2008 and early 2009. Figure 1 illustrates how the total U.S. deficit in goods and services trade was nearly cut in half during this period, creating a political obstacle to kneejerk protectionism. As we will elaborate in section IV, during recessions an improving external balance (from imports falling faster than exports) often acts an “automatic international economic stabilizer,” which temporarily fulfills an equivalent economic function to a Keynesian government stimulus package. The “external sector” of the U.S. economy during the early quarters of the Great Recession provided an “automatic offset” to sliding U.S. economic activity. This probably caused policymakers to think twice about succumbing to short‐term protectionist instincts. However, figure 1 also shows how **the improvement in the U.S. trade balance has been only temporary** and indeed began to reverse as the U.S. economy exited the Great Recession during the second half of 2009. Crucial for the political threat of protectionism, economic forecasts indicate that the U.S. unemployment rate will probably remain at very high levels over the medium term, despite President Obama’s emphasis on “jobs, jobs, jobs” in his State of the Union Address delivered on January 27th, 2010.4 A time lag of at least 12 to 18 months probably separates the point at which the U.S. trade balance showed maximum improvement (spring 2009) and the expected drop in measured unemployment well below 10 percent (fall 2010). **Absent the “feel good” factor of an improving trade balance**, but facing continuing high unemployment levels, **protectionist sentiment in the** U.S. **Congress may increase** in the coming months, especially as the November 2010 midterm election draws near. This is particularly so, as current economic forecasts suggest a more robust U.S. economic recovery in the coming years, relative to other industrial trading partners (table 1). A large and growing deficit in the U.S. external balances will likely persist for some time, while the external balances of other major trading partners could hold steady or even improve. If the United States thus returns to its “pre‐crisis role as the world’s importer/consumer of last resort,” **protectionist impulses in the U.S. Congress are destined to escalate**. Fresh U.S. protectionist initiatives, at a time when the U.S. economy is growing at a decent pace, will likely invite **in‐kind retaliation** by America’s trading partners, despite the relatively muted reaction to the original “Buy American” provisions in early 2009 and other protectionist measures implemented since then. No longer facing a newly‐elected U.S. president, who entered office with considerable global appeal in the midst of an unprecedented economic crisis, foreign leaders are unlikely to give the U.S. an easy pass on future new instances of U.S. protectionism.

#### Trade deficit key political motivator for protectionism

Mankiw, Econ Prof at Harvard, 2005

Reflections on the Trade Deficit and Fiscal Policy, <http://www.economics.harvard.edu/files/faculty/40_trade_deficit_dec_2005.pdf>

Sadly, this mercantilist point of view has started to affect policy, or at least public discussion of it. It lies behind Senator Schumer’s call for a 27.5 percent tariff on all imports from China until China revalues its exchange rate. And it lays behind some the rhetoric coming out of the Bush administration. On December 5, 2005, the White House put out a “Fact Sheet” on the President’s “Agenda for Economic Growth” that lists the quotas on Chinese textiles as one of their accomplishments. I am sure that the economics team inside the White House, including Al Hubbard, John Snow, and Ben Bernanke, knows that import quotas are bad policy from a strictly economic point of view. The quotas are a response to inexorable political pressure. At best, they are an attempt to foreclose even worse outcomes, such as Senator Schumer’s tariffs. But I also know that the communications team at the White House, who drafts such Fact Sheets, often has a different take on things. They are charged not with making policy but with selling it. If mercantilist arguments resonate with the public, then mercantilist arguments is what we will get. And some people on the communications team may actually have sympathy with this mercantilist point of view. From the perspective of the Beltway mercantilists, the trade deficit is a huge national problem. They look at the trade deficit simply as lost jobs for Americans. In my view, the biggest risk about the trade deficit is that, combined with the widespread mercantilist worldview, it will **strengthen the hand of the protectionists**. I am far less worried about the trade deficit in and of itself than I am in the possibility that it will end up giving Senator Schumer and his colleagues the upper hand in the debate over trade policy.

### Trade Deficit Add-On

#### The massive trade deficit creates unsustainable debt – causes global war

Elliott, Economics Editor at the Guardian, 2006

Is America Heading for Economic Collapse?,

http://edstrong.blog-city.com/is\_america\_heading\_for\_economic\_collapse.htm

There are those who say that the trade deficit is not a problem for the US. They argue that it is perfectly sustainable to run sizeable deficits in perpetuity because the dollar's status as a reserve currency means that there will always be demand for US assets. But there are two points here. First, running a permanent trade deficit affects the structure of your economy. It means fewer manufacturing jobs where productivity tends to be higher and more jobs in the service sector, where productivity tends to be lower. The US has struck a Faustian bargain with its trading partners, particularly China, responsible for about one third of the $700bn-plus trade total last year. As the American economist Tom Palley puts it: "US consumers get lots of cheap goods in return for which they give over paper IOUs that cost less to print. Meanwhile, China creates millions of jobs and builds modern factories that are transforming it into an industrial superpower, and it also accumulates billions of dollars in financial claims against the US. From this perspective, trade deficits don't matter because there are no limits to either government or private borrowing, and because manufacturing doesn't matter either." The logic of this, Palley notes drily, is that the US would benefit even further if China devalued its exchange rate and ran a larger trade surplus. The second point is potentially much more explosive: it is the one sketched out in the crystal ball gazing at the top of this piece. What would happen if, as a result of global developments over the coming decades, the dollar ceased to be the reserve currency of choice. This was a point raised by Avinash Persaud, one of the financial sector's more original thinkers, in a recent lecture in New York. Persaud's argument is as follows.  Throughout history, there has always tended to be one dominant reserve currency along with a host of lesser rivals. In the 19th century Britain was the pre-eminent economy and sterling was the main reserve currency.  Yet currencies don't retain their dominance forever; part of Britain's problem at the time of Suez was that it was struggling to adjust to a world in which it was no longer the top-dog currency but the creditors came knocking at the door asking for their cheques to be cashed.   The US is living beyond its means, hoping that nobody cashes the cheques it has been merrily writing as the current account has gone deeper into the red. That's the advantage of being a reserve currency, even though, as Persaud notes, there is no rule which says that you have to run current account deficits simply because you are a reserve currency.   Britain didn't a century ago. In the decade or so up to the first world war it had a trade surplus of 5% of GDP. "That is a mirror image of the US today. The UK was in surplus by as much as the US is in deficit." That deficit has enabled the Chinese to build up their industrial strength at a rapid rate, so much so that it is probable that China - and perhaps India - will have overtaken the US as the world's largest economy (on a purchasing power parity basis, at least) by 2050.  Persaud thinks that the upshot of this will be that in the next few decades the dollar will start to lose its reserve status just as sterling did in the last century. "In the case of sterling's loss of reserve status, world war one and two accelerated a process that had begun more slowly before and ended abruptly with debt and inflation." Today the process is also being accelerated - by wars where the end is as elusive as the enemy and by a consumerism built on a property bubble. Perhaps we will not have to wait until 2050. In my lifetime, the dollar will start to lose its reserve currency status, not to the euro but to the renminbi or the rupee. This would clearly have massive economic and geopolitical consequences. As Persaud rightly says: "If it was economically and politically painful for the UK, even though its international financial position did not begin from a position of heavy deficit, what will it be like for the US which has become the world's largest debtor.  "There will be an avalanche of cheques coming home to be paid when the dollar begins to lose its status." And this "avalanche of cheques" is likely to make for the **most horrendous geo-political tension**. The idea that the US will give up global financial hegemony **without a fight seems fanciful in the extreme**.

### Accidents Add-On

#### Increasing highway spending key to reduce accidents

Andrew Gillman, Director of Public Relations and Performance Marketing at the Road Connection,2/27/2012, “The Future of the U.S. Highway System: A look into the grave situation facing our roadways,” http://www.forconstructionpros.com/whitepaper/10634303/the-future-of-the-us-highway-system

In addition to boosting this economy, an increase in the quality of U.S. roadways translates into fewer traffic fatalities and vehicle maintenance and repair costs. About 33,000 automobile fatalities occur on a yearly basis, and poor road conditions are a factor in one-­‐third of those 33,000 fatalities. As far as safety concerning this country’s bridges, the situation is just as grave. Dozens of bridges have collapsed in the past forty years, killing hundreds. Additionally, up to one fourth of the bridges throughout the United States are rated as structurally deficient.

#### Large trucks transport hazardous materials – accidents can cause a Chernobyl level disaster

Michael Parrish, Staff writer for the Los Angeles Times, September 20, 1992 [LAT]

Day and night, an intricate national transportation network hauls the commonplace poisons of modern life across the countryside and through city neighborhoods. Chlorine for water treatment, ammonia for fertilizer, pesticides, industrial acids, corrosives, explosives and plain old gasoline are shipped in huge volumes -- along with dramatically expanding quantities of exotic new chemicals. Small things go wrong all the time on the trucks, trains, ships and planes that carry these hazardous goods. Valves leak. Drums break loose. Trucks jackknife. But big accidents happen too. And then the consequences can be enormous -- as in two train derailments in California last year that brought environmental devastation to the Sacramento River and massive disruption to Ventura County. Defenders say significant improvements have been made in the transport of hazardous materials over the last 10 years. But a Times computer study of nearly 68,000 hazardous-materials incidents in that period confirms what anyone knows who has been injured, evacuated or stuck on the freeway behind a tanker such as the one that exploded in flames Friday on the Hollywood Freeway -- or worse, who has lost a friend or relative to a hazardous-materials accident: While the U.S. transport system has yet to see the equal of Bhopal or Chernobyl, neither people nor the economy nor the land have been spared.

#### Hazardous materials spills cause species extinctions and ecosystem collapse

Lewiston Morning Tribune – 1/9/2002

Three water treatment plants resumed pumping water from the Clearwater River Tuesday, two days after a truck accident on U.S. Highway 12 dumped at least 6,000 gallons of diesel into the river. Fish and wildlife officials continued to monitor the river for signs of harm to the environment, while Nez Perce tribal officials questioned the wisdom of shipping hazardous materials along the winding river that is home to several threatened species. Officials from the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, Idaho District II Health Department and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency are advising citizens at Kamiah, Orofino and Riverside not to drink the water until test results verify it's free of contaminants. But some local officials say the water is safe. "We are fully confident there is no problem with the city of Orofino's water," said Mayor Joe Pippenger. "There is no smell or taste in the water that we can find." A press release issued by Pippenger and the city council said the water is safe to drink even if people smell or taste diesel. Kamiah Mayor Bob Olive also expressed confidence in his city's water. "We are filling the reservoir up and DEQ was going to do some testing on the water right away," said Olive. "We don't feel there is going to be a problem." Bottled water will be provided to those wishing to wait for test results. Hi-Noon Petroleum Co. at Missoula, the owner of the truck that caused the spill, arranged to have bottled drinking water shipped to Orofino, Riverside and Kamiah as a precaution. Olive said the water was available at city hall for anyone uncomfortable with drinking water from the tap. "Some people have an imagination and there are going to be people who smell and taste diesel in the water even if it's not there," he said. Lt. Col. Tim Marsano of the Idaho National Guard said the state DEQ, District II Health Department and the EPA can't give the all-clear until test results indicate the water is safe. "The incident command group has taken a wait-and-see outlook on the situation. We are waiting for the tests to come back from the lab before we are willing to tell people that the water is safe to drink." Marsano, who is serving at an information center in Lewiston established by several state, federal and local agencies responding to the spill, said the results should be in by noon today. As an extra precaution, absorbent barriers were placed in front of raw water intakes at all three treatment plants and at the city of Lewiston's water intake system to prevent diesel from finding its way into the water supply. Lewiston continues to have several days of water on reserve as well as the ability to access well water. The main plume of diesel was expected reach Lewiston sometime Tuesday night or early Wednesday morning. "We understand from DEQ probably our citizens will notice an odor (when the plume arrives) but our water system is safe and will continue to be safe," said Lewiston City Manager Jan B. Vasser. Officials from state, federal and tribal fish and wildlife agencies continued to monitor the river for signs of damage Tuesday while HazMat workers and private contractors to mopped up after the spill. HazMat workers and private contractors removed several hundred yards of soil from the accident site and are following the main plume as it progresses downstream. Marsano said it would probably not be possible to remove any more diesel from the water once it reaches the Snake River. "The incident command center feels its very unlikely any recoverable product will go past Lewiston," he said. Ed Schriever of the Idaho Department of Fish and Game said biologists observed a full range of fish and wildlife species along the river and none displayed behavior indicating harm from the spill. "We are continuing to monitor and will throughout the week," he said. The river is home to threatened and endangered species including fall chinook salmon, wild steelhead trout and bull trout. Bald eagles also winter along the river and osprey perch in trees along its banks. The spill happened in the middle of steelhead fishing season that runs from September through April. The Nez Perce Tribe said Tuesday it would participate as a partner in the clean-up effort and ongoing monitoring of environmental impacts. "This unfortunate incident has impacted an ecosystem that is vitally important to the Nez Perce Tribe," said Samuel N. Penney, Chairman of the tribe's Executive Committee. Penney also questioned the wisdom of transporting hazardous materials along the river. "Our ability to maintain and protect fish and wildlife species in a healthy and productive watershed ecosystem is impacted by the transportation of hazardous materials along the Clearwater River. This incident exemplifies the need to develop alternate routes for hazardous materials transportation where precious resources are concerned."

### Accidents Add-On

#### Species loss causes extinction

Paul Wapner, American University, Dept of International Politics and Foreign Policy, August, Politics and Life Sciences, 1994, p. 177

Massive extinction of species is dangerous, then, because one cannot predict which species are expendable to the system as a whole. As Philip Hoose remarks, "Plants and animals cannot tell us what they mean to each other." One can never be sure which species holds up fundamental biological relationships in the planetary ecosystem. And, because removing species is an irreversible act, it may be too late to save the system after the extinction of key plants or animals. According to the U.S. National Research Council, "The ramifications of an ecological change of this magnitude [vast extinction of species] are so far reaching that no one on earth will escape them." Trifling with the "lives" of species is like playing Russian roulette, with our collective future as the stakes.

#### Traffic accidents cost billions in lawsuits and insurance costs

Jim Wilkinson, Policy Analyst, September, 1993 [Risk Management]

According to the National Safety Council, the minimum average cost of a fatal motor vehicle accident is estimated to be about $450,000. An accident involving an incapacitating injury will set a company back at least $42,400. The council also estimated that in the United States, motor vehicle accidents accounted for $24.5 billion in wage losses, $6.7 billion in medical expenses, $27.7 billion in insurance administration costs, $8.2 billion in uninsured work loss and over $29 billion in vehicle damages. Add to the dollar figures the grief, loss of self-esteem, loss of potential sales and inconvenience and one can begin to understand the immensity of this absolutely staggering problem. A large pizza company just recently agreed to a settlement of $2.8 million in a case involving a motor vehicle accident. That is just one of countless cases in which companies and/or their insurers had to pay millions for an incident involving a motor vehicle. As long as there are numbers like that, risk managers should take notice of their companies' programs for driver training and safety.

#### This is the biggest internal link to the economy

John W. Snow, Secretary of the Treasury, March 29, 2004 [States News Service]

We also need Congress to help us enact meaningful lawsuit abuse reform. Excessive, baseless suits are acting as a drag on your businesses and our nation's economy, and that's got to change. The threat of frivolous lawsuits is the ultimate disincentive for hiring new people, and the President has called on Congress to act. We have choices to make in this country regarding our economy. And I believe that we must choose a path that we know will lead to growth.We have to choose between higher taxes and lower taxes. We have to choose between economic isolationism or embracing the opportunity of the world's markets. And we must choose between our historic national attitude of "can do" and the attitude that personal injury lawyers have encouraged, and that is: "can sue."These are the choices that most impact business decisions and the future of our economy.

### AT: Politics DA

#### Strong political support for increasing highway funding

AASHTO, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, February 2007, “TRANSPORTATION INVEST IN OUR FUTURE,” www.transportation1.org/tif1report/TIF1-1.pdf

Congress could dramatically increase funding to reduce the very large backlog of cost-effective highway projects via two changes: (1) shifting non-highway programs either to general revenues or to the states, and (2) narrowing the federal Highway Trust Fund’s focus to rebuilding and modernizing the Interstate system, both urban and inter-city. This Interstate 2.0 approach would increase federal investment in the nation’s most important arteries by nearly $10 billion per year. Refocusing the federal gas tax on rebuilding and modernizing these vital roadways would restore the kind of trust in the Highway Trust Fund that was present during its early years. Making this change is also probably the best hope we have for gaining political support, not for all-purpose transportation tax increases, but for significantly improving the performance of the nation’s most critically important highway infrastructure.

#### Funding for IHS improvements is popular because everyone benefits

AASHTO, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, February 2007, “TRANSPORTATION INVEST IN OUR FUTURE,” www.transportation1.org/tif1report/TIF1-1.pdf

This study accepts the case for large-scale increases in highway investment, to eliminate the backlog of cost-effective highway and bridge repair and modernization projects to rebuild the aging Interstate system as it begins reaching the end of its original design life, and to improve mobility for people and goods where needed. But it argues that increasing federal investment is unlikely and unwise without major changes in focus and practices. To re-create public support for a revised federal program, that program must offer direct improvements in service to those asked to pay the bills. Interstate 2.0, rebuilding and modernizing the federal Interstate system, both urban and rural, could gain the support of motorists and truckers, since they would directly benefit from the reduced congestion and improved service quality that would result.

#### Surveys show that highway funding is massively popular

Michael Bronzini, Professor Emeritus and Research Professor at George Mason University, 2011, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION: THE CASE FOR GROWTH, pg. 10

Surveys, such as a recent one by the Rockefeller Foundation (Hart Research Associates and Public Opinion Strategies, 2011), have consistently shown that the public will support funding of transportation projects if it can be shown that the money is being spent on needed improvements such as better highways and public transit, and that government funds are being expended efficiently and wisely. Other surveys have also shown public support for increased transportation taxes if the proceeds are used to fund identified transportation improvements. For example, in a survey by the Mineta Transportation Institute (Agrawal, et al., 2011), 62% of respondents supported a gas tax increase of 10 cents per gallon to improve road maintenance. However, "for tax options where the revenues were to be spent for undefined transportation purposes, then support levels varied considerably by what kind of tax would be imposed, with a sales tax much more popular than either a gas tax increase or a new mileage tax." The Rockefeller Foundation survey was one of the first to show resistance to increased taxation, despite the support shown for investments in transportation infrastructure.

### AT: States CP

#### Federal action key to IHS – allows appropriate geographic planning

Chad Shirley, Deputy Assistant Director at Congressional Budget Office, January 2011, “Spending and Funding for Highways,” pg. 1

To the extent that spending on highway infrastructure contributes to improved economic performance on a wide scale—by, for instance, lowering the costs of transporting labor and materials to production facilities and finished goods to consumers throughout the country or a broad region— having those spending decisions made at the federal level is more efficient because it aligns the decisionmakers with the geographic scope of the benefits. Therefore, certain kinds of spending (for example, to facilitate transportation planning in areas that encompass different states) or spending on certain kinds of highways (such as those in the Interstate system) may be more efficiently directed by the federal government.

Federal action key

Federal government key to solve - they are the only actor with enough information

Chad Shirley, Deputy Assistant Director at Congressional Budget Office, January 2011, “Spending and Funding for Highways,” pg. 1

From the point of view of economic efficiency, decision-making authority is best placed with those who have the incentive (along with the information) to weigh all of the costs and benefits of the decisions. Whether the federal government or state or local governments make more efficient decisions about highway projects depends on who receives the benefits of those decisions and who bears the costs. Having the federal government select highway projects at the national level promotes projects with broader geographic benefits, but state and local governments may be best situated to identify and set priori- ties among highway projects if the benefits are expected to be realized primarily at the state or local level. The benefits of highway projects vary significantly in their size and geographic scope, and realizing the greatest economic gains from highway spending depends on identifying economically advantageous projects.

#### Federal action key to solve the Interstate Highway system – dispute mediation

Robert Poole, President of the Reason Foundation, June 2000, “Another Reason for Airport Privatization,” http://www.thefreemanonline.org/features/another-reason-for-airport-privatization/

If we could start with a clean sheet of paper in the highway sector, it would seem obvious that federal transportation dollars should be narrowly focused on transportation projects that are clearly national in scope or impact. Instead of focusing on funding state programs through a highly politicized process plagued by redistribution, pork barrel spending and projects that would never pass a benefit/cost analysis, federal transportation policy should focus on key areas of national interest: Maintaining the Interstate system—The federal government should work with states to maintain the core national mobility and goods movement network. Interstate highway upgrades—When state highways link up regionally in fast-growing corridors, sometimes an upgrade to an Interstate will make sense, and the federal government should partner with states to accomplish that. Multi-state coordination—Some transportation problems, particularly in expanding urban areas, have taken on multi-state dimensions. The federal government can serve a useful role in mediating and even coordinating transportation decisions, infrastructure and funding, given its constitutional role in facilitating interstate commerce.

### AT: States CP

#### Only the federal government can solve – research leadership

Robert Poole, President of the Reason Foundation, June 2000, “Another Reason for Airport Privatization,” http://www.thefreemanonline.org/features/another-reason-for-airport-privatization/

Freight corridors—Producers need the roads to get materials in and products out; services need roads to interact with customers, and consumers need roads to connect with goods and services. Protecting interstate commerce is a national issue and federal transportation policy should ensure that major interstate goods movement corridors and bottlenecks receive adequate capacity and maintenance. Transportation research, safety and related issues—The federal government has been the lead driver on a lot of research into new technologies and methods of managing transportation systems, coordinating common standards, incentivizing experimentation and innovation. Highway safety regulation, in a major nation involved in the global economy, needs to be uniform and national in scope, so it is appropriate that the National Highway & Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) and the National Motor Carrier Safety Administration (NMCSA) be part of the U.S. Department of Transportation and federally funded.

#### IHS federalization solves best – the counterplan fuels a backlash

Robert Poole, Director of transportation policy at Reason Foundation, August 2010, “Restoring Trust in the Highway Trust Fund,” reason.org/files/restoring\_highway\_trust\_fund.pdf

Despite Congress’s subsequent departure from the users-pay/users-benefit principle, there is a strong case for the Interstate system to remain a federal program, for three reasons. First of all, ensuring the free flow of commerce among the states and across our national borders is in the DNA of the Constitution. One of the reasons the Founders replaced the Articles of Confederation was that states were charging tariffs at their borders and impeding the flow of commerce. Between the interstate commerce clause and the post-roads provision, ample justification exists for a federal system of superhighways with common technical standards. Second, the benefits of such a system extend beyond the borders of any state. Some portions of the Interstate system, such as the freeways serving the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, facilitate the flow of a large fraction of all oceangoing cargo between the United States and Asia, benefiting all Americans. But the burdens of this nationally beneficial infrastructure​—​in terms of traffic congestion, noise, and air pollution​—​are borne primarily by residents of Southern California, who reap only a fraction of the benefits. Likewise, residents of the Seattle area benefit from commerce that moves through their ports and onto Interstates that traverse the mountain West. National benefits of this kind do not arise from the numerous other programs Congress now pays for with federal highway user tax revenue: state highways, urban transit, bike paths, recreational trails, sidewalks. Those programs’ benefits are purely local, and they should be supported locally. Third, in terms of practical politics, any move to “defederalize” the Interstates would be fiercely opposed by highway user groups, such as trucking and automobile associations. While this “highway lobby” does not have the clout it had during the original Interstate and freeway era, its influence is still a significant factor in debates on federal transportation policy.

#### The plan solves best by allowing states to focus on non-interstate highways

Robert Poole, Director of transportation policy at Reason Foundation, August 2010, “Restoring Trust in the Highway Trust Fund,” reason.org/files/restoring\_highway\_trust\_fund.pdf

Most states would be better off with the proposal presented in this paper. All would benefit from the major reconstruction and modernization of their most important highways, the Interstates. They would gain new freedom to manage their non-Interstate highways, freed from costly federal requirements and priorities, and instead could focus on their own transportation needs and goals. On the funding side, although they would no longer receive federal funding for non-Interstates, they would gain new freedom to use tolling and public-private partnerships to shore up their programs. If they decided to replace some former federal revenue, states could find savings by aggressive efforts to improve efficiency, prioritizing projects that will produce the largest benefits, and embracing tolling to pay for new roads and improvements to existing ones, preferably via public-private partnerships that shift financing and risk away from taxpayers and onto the private sector.

### AT: Privatization CP

#### Private actors won’t provide enough roads to replace the IHS

Michael Bronzini, Professor Emeritus and Research Professor at George Mason University, 2011, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION: THE CASE FOR GROWTH, pg. 7

Is government involvement in the surface transportation system necessary? Historically the answer worldwide has been "yes." The basic reason is that private enterprise will not, on its own, provide the needed systems and services. A full network of highways, for example, is needed to provide the desired inter-regional service. Were these roads all to be toll roads many segments would not have sufficient traffic to pay for themselves, so private operators would not choose to build them.

#### Only government action can solve – capitalization, long term outlook, and broad span of control

Michael Bronzini, Professor Emeritus and Research Professor at George Mason University, 2011, SURFACE TRANSPORTATION: THE CASE FOR GROWTH, pg. 7

Only state and federal governments have the capitalization, long-term outlook, and broad span of control required to build and operate the highway network. Also transportation routes have the characteristics of natural monopolies. It would not be efficient for rival highway operators to provide competing parallel links in densely populated corridors. Finally, safety considerations dictate that highways be built to the same standards over wide areas, which requires government involvement at least at the level of setting and implementing design standards. While government is necessarily involved in transportation there is room for debate about the relative roles of federal, state, and local governments and the private sector.

#### Privatization logic doesn’t apply to highways – competition not feasible

Chad Shirley, Deputy Assistant Director at Congressional Budget Office, January 2011, “Spending and Funding for Highways,” pg. 1

The public sector provides most highway infrastructure for several reasons that tend to limit the role of the private sector. First, such infrastructure displays, at least to some degree, important characteristics of “public goods.” Such goods are usually not profitable for the private sector to produce, because once they have been produced, they are available to anyone who wants to use them; as a result, they are often provided by the public sector. Second, because such infrastructure is costly to build, though less expensive to operate and maintain, having competing highway networks is not practical. As a result, such “natural monopolies” are often either provided directly by the government or regulated by it.

### AT: Privatization CP

#### Interstate commerce concerns prevent privatization solvency

Chad Shirley, Deputy Assistant Director at Congressional Budget Office, January 2011, “Spending and Funding for Highways,” pg. 1

Third, the benefits of highways—promoting commerce, for instance—may extend beyond the places where they are built and beyond the people who use them directly. All three of those characteristics of highway infrastructure tend to limit the incentives for the private sector to provide it. The private sector, on its own, would provide less of that type of infrastructure than is socially beneficial.

#### Historical evidence proves highway privatization failure

John Williamson, Information Research Specialist at the Congressional Research Service, 1/6/2012, “Federal Aid to Roads and Highways Since the 18th Century: A Legislative History,” www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R42140.pdf

In the absence of significant federal support for highways in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, and with state encouragement and, often, investment, private companies built toll roads in many states. The roads were often financially unsuccessful unless they connected city pairs or provided a farm-or-factory-to-market route with sufficient traffic to cover costs. In discussing the failures of these roads, Secretary Albert Gallatin wrote, It is sufficiently evident that, whenever the annual expense of transportation on a certain route, in its natural state, exceeds the interest on the capital employed in improving the communication, and the annual expense of transportation (exclusively of the tolls) by the improved route, the difference is an annual additional income to the nation. Nor does in that case the general result vary, although the tolls may not have been fixed at a rate sufficient to pay to the undertakers the interest on the capital laid out. They, indeed, when that happens, lose; but the community is nevertheless benefited by the undertaking.8 The boom in turnpike construction began in the late 1790s and lasted, with a roughly 10-year interruption in the 1830s, until the mid-19th century.9 By 1830, more than 8,000 miles of roads had been built or converted to turnpikes under state charters of incorporation. Very few toll roads made consistent profits for their investors and the failure rate appears to have been high even in the early years predating rail and canal competition. Despite these financial difficulties, the toll roads were, without a doubt, the best roads in the country, and had a significant role in short- and medium-distance freight and passenger movement between the cities and larger towns. With the spread of the railway networks, however, the toll roads lost nearly all their passenger and most of their freight business to rail competition. As the longer turnpikes failed, shorter toll roads were chartered as feeder lines to rail service.

#### Toll inflation undermines counterplan solvency

JayEtta Z. Hecker, Director of Physical Infrastructure Issues at the GAO, 7/24/, 2008, “HIGHWAY PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS. More Rigorous Up-front Analysis Could Better Secure Potential Benefits and Protect the Public Interest,” www.gao.gov/new.items/d081052t.pdf

Highway public-private partnerships have resulted in advantages for state and local governments, such as obtaining new facilities and value from existing facilities without using public funding. The public can potentially obtain other benefits, such as sharing risks with the private sector, more efficient operations and management of facilities, and, through the use of tolling, increased mobility and more cost effective investment decisions. There are also potential costs and trade-offs—there is no “free” money in public-private partnerships and it is likely that tolls on a privately operated highway will increase to a greater extent than they would on a publicly operated toll road. There is also the risk of tolls being set that exceed the costs of the facility, including a reasonable rate of return, should a private concessionaire gain market power because of the lack of viable travel alternatives. Highway public-private partnerships are also potentially more costly to the public than traditional procurement methods and the public sector gives up a measure of control, such as the ability to influence toll rates. Finally, as with any highway project, there are multiple stakeholders and trade-offs in protecting the public interest.

### AT: Non-IHS CP

#### The IHS is the most important category of transportation

Ed Regan, Executive vice president at Wilbur Smith Associates, Spring 2011, “BUILDING THE CASE FOR TOLLING THE INTERSTATES,” pg. 5

The interstate highways are, without question, the most important category of surface transportation facilities in America. They represent only about 1.1 percent of the nation’s total public road mile- age and just 6 percent of all miles that come under state DOT jurisdiction. Yet they carry 24 percent of all vehicle miles of travel (VMT) throughout the country, and that share has increased over the last two decades. In urban areas, interstate highways and other non-interstate freeways carry more than 35 percent of all VMT, yet the vast majority of this is not currently priced and is primarily dependent on state funding for maintenance, rehabilitation and ultimate reconstruction.

#### Developing alternate modes of transit won’t solve – people will shift back to driving

Randal O’Toole, Senior fellow with the Cato Institute, 5/15/2012, “Ending Congestion by Refinancing Highways,” www.cato.org/pubs/pas/PA695.pdf

In most cities, there is good reason to think that actual traffic flows exceed the maximum flow capacities for only a few minutes each day. Once flows exceed capacities, traffic flows shrink due to congestion and people alter their travel habits to avoid that congestion. They may shift the time they travel, their travel route or destination (for example, by changing job locations), or, in a small share of cases, their mode of travel. For this reason, efforts to relieve congestion by improving alternate modes of travel, such as rail transit, will deliver little relief: any con- gestion relief initially provided by transit will simply result in some people shifting back to driving during the peak periods.

#### Even a huge expansion of public transit won’t significantly reduce driving

Anthony Downs, Senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, Fall 2004, “Why Traffic Congestion Is Here to Stay...and Will Get Worse,” Access, pg. 21

3. Greatly expand public transit capacity. The third approach is to expand public transit capacity enough to shift so many people from cars to transit that there would be no more excess demand for roads during peak hours. A major reason this approach isn’t feasible is that a very small percentage of commuters today use transit. Even if the nation’s existing transit capacity were increased fourfold and fully utilized, morning peak-hour transit travel would rise only to 11 percent of all morning trips. That would reduce private vehicle trips by only 8.8 percent—hardly enough to end congestion. Moreover, such a quadrupling of transit capacity would be extremely costly.

## Space Elevator Aff
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#### Observation One – Inherency

#### NASA has terminated research on space elevators

Dan Vergano, 8-9-2009, “An elevator to space?” USA Today, http://www.usatoday.com/tech/science/columnist/vergano/2009-08-09-nasa-advanced\_N.htm

Space elevators? Alien worlds? Deep-space plasma rockets? No, it's not science-fiction — it's history —NASA's late, lamented Institute for Advanced Concepts (NIAC). Exotic telescopes, tethered slingshots to shuttle cargo from the moon to Mars and skin-tight space suits were just some of the technologies the institute ponied up seed money to explore. The institute succumbed to new priorities when President Bush announced the Vision for Space Exploration involving manned flights to the moon. Essentially, NASA chief Mike Griffin decided two years ago that his agency's mission was going for the moon today, rather than the stars tomorrow, ending its $4 million yearly funding of the institute. "NASA, faced with the constraints of achieving the Vision for Space Exploration, has made the difficult decision to terminate NIAC," the space agency announced in 2007.

#### Plan: The United States Federal Government should build a space elevator in the United States.

#### Advantage One – Colonization

#### High risk of an asteroid hitting earth and causing extinction

Gregg Easterbrook, Editor of The Atlantic and The New Republic and Sr. Fellow at Brookings, June 2008 “The Sky is Falling,” http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/200806/asteroids

A generation ago, the standard assumption was that a dangerous object would strike Earth perhaps once in a million years. By the mid-1990s, researchers began to say that the threat was greater: perhaps a strike every 300,000 years. This winter, I asked William Ailor, an asteroid specialist at The Aerospace Corporation, a think tank for the Air Force, what he thought the risk was. Ailor’s answer: a one-in-10 chance per century of a dangerous space-object strike. Regardless of which estimate is correct, the likelihood of an event is, of course, no predictor. Even if space strikes are likely only once every million years, that doesn’t mean a million years will pass before the next impact—the sky could suddenly darken tomorrow. Equally important, improbable but cataclysmic dangers ought to command attention because of their scope. A tornado is far more likely than an asteroid strike, but humanity is sure to survive the former. The chances that any one person will die in an airline crash are minute, but this does not prevent us from caring about aviation safety. And as Nathan Myhrvold, the former chief technology officer of Microsoft, put it, “The odds of a space-object strike during your lifetime may be no more than the odds you will die in a plane crash—but with space rocks, it’s like the entire human race is riding on the plane.”

#### A space elevator would enable space exploration

Peter and Cathy Swan, Teaching Science and Technology in Paradise Valley 4-24-2006, “Why we need a space elevator,” Space Policy 22, http://www.mendeley.com/research/we-need-space-elevator/

The goals of and vision for development of a space elevator have been discussed repeatedly. However, why we should develop one has been glossed over. This paper will focus upon the major issue-why build a space elevator infrastructure? It considers why we need a space elevator, what missions it would enable and how far it would reduce costs. There is no doubt that some major missions would be enhanced or significantly enabled by a space elevator infrastructure. Global communications, energy, monitoring of the Earth, global/national security, planetary defense, and exploration beyond low-Earth orbit are a few examples. In the end, if we are serious about extending space development and avoiding limitations on the human spirit, the reason we should build a space elevator is because we must!
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#### Failure to colonize space results in extinction

James Oberg, Space Engineer, 1999, “Space Power Theory,” http://www.jamesoberg.com/books/spt/new-CHAPTERSw\_figs.pdf

We have the great gift of yet another period when our nation is not threatened; and our world is free from opposing coalitions with great global capabilities. We can use this period to take our nation and our fellow men into the greatest adventure that our species has ever embarked upon. The United States can lead, protect, and help the rest of mankind to move into space. It is particularly fitting that a country comprised of people from all over the globe assumes that role. This is a manifest destiny worthy of dreamers and poets, warriors and conquerors. In his last book, Pale Blue Dot, Carl Sagan presents an emotional argument that our species must venture into the vast realm of space to establish a spacefaring civilization. While acknowledging the very high costs that are involved in manned spaceflight, Sagan states that our very survival as a species depends on colonizing outer space. Astronomers have already identified dozens of asteroids that might someday smash into Earth. Undoubtedly, many more remain undetected. In Sagan’s opinion, the only way to avert inevitable catastrophe is for mankind to establish a permanent human presence in space. He compares humans to the planets that roam the night sky, as he says that humans will too wander through space. We will wander space because we possess a compulsion to explore, and space provides a truly infinite prospect of new directions to explore. Sagan’s vision is part science and part emotion. He hoped that the exploration of space would unify humankind. We propose that mankind follow the United States and our allies into this new sea, set with jeweled stars. If we lead, we can be both strong and caring. If we step back, it may be to the detriment of more than our country.

#### Advantage Two – Stimulus

#### Fiscal cliff will cause a recession now – only more stimulus can solve

Hao Li, 4-17-2012, “US Economic Outlook 2013 Heading Off 'Fiscal Cliff’,” IB Times, http://www.ibtimes.com/articles/329558/20120417/economic-outlook-2013.htm?cid=2

The U.S. economic outlook for next year is being shadowed by what economists are calling the "fiscal cliff" of 2013 -- the expiration of enormous tax cuts and transfer payments. These fiscal stimulus measures -- including the Bush-era tax cuts, the 2010-2011 payroll tax cut and extended unemployment insurance benefits -- will expire at the beginning of 2013 unless Washington renews them. They amount to about 5 percent of the U.S. gross domestic product, according to calculations from Morgan Stanley. Taxes imposed by the "Obamacare" reforms will add to the fiscal punch. While no one expects Washington to let every single one of these measures to expire in 2013, the fear is that a significant number of them will. In a worst-case scenario, the presidential and congressional elections produce such a fierce deadlock that Washington lets most of them expire. David Greenlaw, an economist with Morgan Stanley, thinks there is a "non-zero probability" of this happening. The last time the U.S. faced a fiscal cliff close to 5 percent of GDP was in 1969. Before the fiscal contractions set in that year, the real economy was expanding at an annual pace of 5 percent and the unemployment rate was below 4 percent. By the end of 1969, however, the economy had entered a recession.

#### The economy is slowing now because stimulus measures are ending

Eileen Applebaum, PhD Economics, 4-27-2012, “Blame Budget Austerity for Poor GDP Growth,” http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/economic-intelligence/2012/04/27/blame-budget-austerity-for-poor-gdp-growth

As the Obama administration's 2009 stimulus continues to wind down, the effects on the US economy are showing up in the economic data. Coming out of a steep recession, the economy should be experiencing robust output, or GDP, growth. Output growth of 3 percent in the fourth quarter of 2011 helped bring the unemployment rate down. However, the government's announcement that output growth fell to 2.2 percent in the first quarter of 2012 should give policy makers pause. The economy needs to grow by at least 2.5 percent just to keep unemployment from rising. Thus this latest figure on GDP growth does not auger well for the job market, which has seen a steady rise over the last few weeks in initial unemployment claims. In the face of weaker demand, Investment spending by business is slowing. Cutbacks in government spending at the federal as well as state and local levels are already hurting GDP growth. In the absence of federal revenue sharing with the states--the first time the federal government has not had such a program when unemployment is above 7 percent--state and local government expenditures have fallen for seven consecutive quarters. [See a collection of political cartoons on the economy.]
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#### Economic decline causes nuclear war

Cesare Merlini, nonresident senior fellow at the Center on the United States and Europe and chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Italian Institute for International Affairs, 5-30-2011, “A Post-Secular World?”, Survival, Vol. 53 Issue 2, http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/00396338.2011.571015

Two neatly opposed scenarios for the future of the world order illustrate the range of possibilities, albeit at the risk of oversimplification. The first scenario entails the premature crumbling of the post-Westphalian system. One or more of the acute tensions apparent today evolves into an open and traditional conflict between states, perhaps even involving the use of nuclear weapons. The crisis might be triggered by a collapse of the global economic and financial system, the vulnerability of which we have just experienced, and the prospect of a second Great Depression, with consequences for peace and democracy similar to those of the first. Whatever the trigger, the unlimited exercise of national sovereignty, exclusive self-interest and rejection of outside interference would self-interest and rejection of outside interference would likely be amplified, emptying, perhaps entirely, the half-full glass of multilateralism, including the UN and the European Union. Many of the more likely conflicts, such as between Israel and Iran or India and Pakistan, have potential religious dimensions. Short of war, tensions such as those related to immigration might become unbearable. Familiar issues of creed and identity could be exacerbated. One way or another, the secular rational approach would be sidestepped by a return to theocratic absolutes, competing or converging with secular absolutes such as unbridled nationalism.

#### Fortunately building a space elevator solves – it’s a massive stimulus

Dr. David Raitt, senior officer @ European Space Agency, and Dr. Bradley Edwards, President X Tech Corp, 2004, “The Space Elevator: Economics and Applications,”

55th International Astronautical Congress, http://www.spaceelevator.com/Docs/Iac-2004/Iac-04-iaa.3.8.3.09.raitt.pdf

Some mega building projects bring immediate and tangible results and benefits to users and therefore may, eventually, justify the cost. In the case of tall towers and buildings, for some there will be accommodation and housing – and the fact of growing upwards rather than expanding outwards will bring environmental benefits because of the reduced footprint. For many – including the general public - the value will be in greater convenience. Bridges allow rapid transport of goods and people between points at a saving of cost and time. The Tokyo Bay Aqualine saves motorists a 50km detour. The Øresund bridge obviates the need to fly or take a car ferry between Copenhagen and Malmö. Similarly the Straits of Gibraltar bridge will immediately open African markets to European goods and vice-versa in an unprecedented manner – the time-saving over sea transportation will be astounding. The Channel Tunnel has opened up the border between Britain and the Continent – permitting quicker freight and passenger transfers. However, despite the fact that the Channel Tunnel was expected to put ferry boats out of business, they still command 50% of the market. Furthermore, budget airlines have also flourished because planes are still perceived by the general public to be faster, even though trains through the tunnel actually provide a quicker city centre to city centre link between London and Paris. Better road and rail links also improve the flow of traffic – the widening of the M25 around London and the Boston Big Dig should do this, so should establishing high-speed rail links as people movers. Maglev trains will help meet growing travel demands, reducing the need for additional highways, rail capacity and airport expansion. In the BaltimoreWashington corridor as well as along the Eastern Seaboard, maglev is projected to divert about 20% of air travel to the maglev mode. It is believed it will divert 27,000 vehicles per day from the highway system in 2010, and reduce daily vehicle kilometres travelled in the corridor in the year 2020 by over 800,000 vehicle kilometres every day. Furthermore, maglev does not produce local air quality impacts associated with gasoline engines, diesel locomotives or jet engines. There are other ways in which communities may benefit. Maglevs are fast people movers and it is suggested that a high speed maglev connection could draw the Baltimore and Washington metropolitan regions closer together by reducing travel times between the two cities to less than 20 minutes. This could foster economic growth, particularly in downtown Baltimore. Maglev could also greatly increase the market share for the BaltimoreWashington International airport in the Washington region by reducing the travel time from downtown Washington. The same applies to other maglev systems connecting cities and airports such as Shanghai where the travel time is reduced a mere seven minutes. Like any major construction project, be it aerospace or construction, significant job opportunities in regard to both construction and operation can manifest themselves. The Channel Tunnel created building infrastructures, shops, petrol stations on each side of the tunnel with all the attendant economic and employment benefits for the regions. The Mackenzie Gas Project aims to have the involvement, participation and ownership of the indigenous communities and will provide work, cheap gas, and heating for homes as well as creating benefits for aboriginal and other northern and Canadian people. Such benefits include education and training, improved skills, employment and business opportunities. Indirect benefits include the expansion of service, transportation and other industries to support the Project, as well as natural gas exploration and development by oil and gas companies. Governments will also benefit by collecting royalty payments and taxes. The Alice Springs to Darwin rail link exceeded its agreement to use a 15% indigenous workforce and, furthermore, land around the track was rehabilitated using native soils in order to meet environmental concerns. In addition, such megaprojects foster new research and development into new technologies and materials (including subsequent spin-offs) as well as additional transportation and industrial applications. This will be the case of the Space Elevator. There has been an interest in beaming power to aircraft for over thirty years and NASA has recently completed trials in which a model aircraft maintained flight through a ground-based laser beam which was converted to electricity by photovoltaic cells on the aircraft to turn the propeller. An aircraft could remain flying without batteries or onboard fuel as long as the laser energy source was uninterrupted. The concept has potential commercial value to the remote sensing and telecommunications industries and the technological advances being developed in laser power beaming for the Space Elevator will be able to be employed in many other applications.
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#### Advantage Three – Launches

#### Increasing space rocket launches will devastate the ozone layer

Lewis Page, Register Space Staff, 4-1-2009, “Space launches could be capped to save ozone layer,” The Register, pg. A6

Currently, global rocket launches deplete the ozone layer [approximately] 0.03%, an insignificant fraction of the depletion caused by other ozone depletion substances (ODSs). As the space industry grows and ODSs fade from the stratosphere, ozone depletion from rockets could become significant ... Large uncertainties in our understanding of ozone loss caused by rocket engines leave open the possibility that launch systems might be limited to as little as several tens of kilotons per year ... limitations on launch systems due to idiosyncratic regulation to protect the ozone layer present a risk to space industrial development. The risk is particularly acute with regard to the economic rationale to develop low-cost, high flight rate launch systems.

#### This leads to human extinction

William Thomas, Investigative Journalist, 8-7-2006, “Scientist Says Chemtrails, Shuttle Launches Endangering Earth,” Chem Trails, http://www.chemtrails911.com/docs/Space%20Shuttle%20Launch-Ozone%20Layer.htm

A Canadian atmospheric scientist warns that chemtrails, airliners and shuttle launches are weakening the stratosphere and destroying Earth’s ozone layer—threatening all life on Earth. It was one of those messages that phones are notorious for delivering—the kind of call that cancels the sleep and makes flu symptoms worse. But this time, the health of the entire planet was at stake. A concerned Canadian scientist named Neil Finley was on the line to inform me that high-altitude jet traffic, space launches and chemtrails are threatening to destroy not only Earth’s protective radiation shielding—but the stratosphere itself.

#### Space launches also cause massive space debris

Australian Space Academy, 2007, “Briefing on Space Law,” ASA, http://www.spaceacademy.net.au/spacelaw/spacelaw.htm

Since the start of the space age the problem of unwanted material or debris in space has been growing. Each space launch usually leaves considerably more than the desired satellite in orbit. Expended rocket boosters, attachment bolts, shields, solid rocket motor slag, and innumerable other items are placed into Earth orbit. Some of these decay (lose altitude) and burn up in the atmosphere - some are large enough to escape complete destruction by ablation and then may pose a potential hazard to life and property on the Earth's surface. In space, materials degrade and detach from satellites; stored energy in the form of unspent fuel and battery vapours may cause explosive rupture and fragmentation of space objects. Collisions between space objects at hypervelocity not only causes damage, but also creates thousands of other space objects (ie fragments of the original objects) which themselves then pose collision hazards to active spacecraft.
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#### Now is key – debris is reaching a critical mass

Thierry Sénéchal, PhD from Columbia University, 2007, “Space Debris Pollution: A Convention Proposal,” Protocol for a Space Debris Risk and Liability Convention, http://www.pon.org/downloads/ien16.2.Senechal.pdf

The time is right for addressing the problem posed by orbital debris and realizing that, if we fail to do so, there will be an increasing risk to continued reliable use of space-based services and operations as well as to the safety of persons and property in space. We have reached a critical threshold at which the density of debris at certain altitudes is high enough to guarantee collisions, thus resulting in increased fragments. In a scenario in which space launches are more frequent, it is likely that we will create a self-sustaining, semi-permanent cloud of orbital ―pollution‖ that threatens all future commercial and exploration activities within certain altitude ranges. The debris and the liability it may cause may also poison relations between major powers.

#### Space debris leads to accidental nuclear conflict

Jeffrey Lewis, Postdoctoral Fellow in the Advanced Methods of Cooperative Study Program, Worked In the Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Policy, Center for Defense Information, 6-2004, “What if Space Were Weaponized?,” Center for Defense Information, <http://www.cdi.org/PDFs/scenarios.pdf>

This is the second of two scenarios that consider how U.S. space weapons might create incentives for America’s opponents to behave in dangerous ways. The previous scenario looked at the systemic risk of accidents that could arise from keeping nuclear weapons on high alert to guard against a space weapons attack. This section focuses on the risk that a single accident in space, such as a piece of space debris striking a Russian early-warning satellite, might be the catalyst for an accidental nuclear war.

#### Building a space elevator would solve – removes the need for rocket launches

Emily Butcher, 2-27-2012, “Space Elevator to be Operable by 2050,” Construction Digital, http://www.constructiondigital.com/innovations/space-elevators-to-be-operable-by-2050

Although NASA researchers released a report on the potential of carbon nanotubes to construct space elevators in the late ‘90s soon after the material was first developed, Obayashi is renewing interest as they pursue plans to find a way to manufacture the tubes more cheaply and efficiently. The long-held dream of leisurely space travel has been overshadowed by staggering price tags, but space elevators would offer a more affordable, as well as safer, alternative to rocket launches. "At this moment, we cannot estimate the cost for the project," an Obayashi official told the newspaper. "However, we'll try to make steady progress so that it won't end just up as simply a dream."
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#### Observation Two – Solvency

#### Space elevator is key to solve – current programs fail and it’s the only alternative to rockets

Bradley Edwards, Physics PhD., Dir. Of Research-Inst. For Scientific Research, 2006, Leaving the Planet by Space Elevator, p. 153-4

So why do it with a Space Elevator? Our current rocket launch technology depends on a handful of launch sites. It is not widely understood that our hold on space travel is tenuous. The much-trumpeted ¡SS depends on servicing from Russian craft and from the Space Shuttle. The Challenger and Columbia disasters shut down the Shuttle program for years. A similar failure for the alternative remaining service option, Russian craft, could mean the end of the ISS. When Hurricane Frances passed through Florida in September 2004, there were real fears that it could wreck Cape Canaveral, America’s prime launch base. james Kennedy of NASA was reported to say after the storm: “...the initial feeling of the 200 employees inside the space center Monday was “that we had dodged a big bullet,” Kennedy said. “I was significantly worried about the future of human space flight based upon that doomsday scenario” of a direct hit by a hurricane with at least Category 4 force.m What about SpaceShipOne? Does that show the way? We very much applaud the efforts of Rutan and others to develop private space planes. However, the general public lacks appreciation of the gap between such planes, and traveling to the Moon. SpaceShipOne is only capable of a brief sub-orbital flight at a height of 1 00 1cm or so above Earth. It only spends a few minutes at that height, which is where space officially “starts”. Why only a few minutes? That word sub—orbital is the clue. It is not going fust enough to stay in orbit. SpaceShipOne cannot orbit the Earth, even at- that Low height. Like a firecracker, it goes up, hovers in space for a moment, and then falls down again, eventually flying back to Earth. As its’ designers acknowledge, there is a big gap between achieving a sub-orbital flight, and going into orbit, or even visiting the ISS which is 386 km up. It is the same equation that hugs all rockets. The extra fuel required to reach orbit would call for a vastly larger craft. In turn, the weight of the larger craft requires more fuel still, and so on. While it is possible that, based on the design experience of such craft, future rocket design might result in rockets that bring the cost of space launches down, we are talking of reductions of only a few percent off present day costs. Even then, we arc still talking about low orbit (LEO) launches. ;dmirab1e as it is, SpaceShipOne is never going to take anyone to the Moon. We currently only have a multi—billion dollar rocket—based program that is an expensive high-risk technology. We need something better if we are to stay in space. To the best of our knowledge today, we can only envisage two ways of getting into space, by rockets, or by climbing up an endless ladder. So, that is where our Space Elevator comes in. It is the only alternative.
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#### The tech is feasible and it can be done quickly

Bradley Edwards, Physics PhD, Dir. Of Research-Inst. For Scientific Research, 12-1-2009, Interview, Next Big Future, http://nextbigfuture.com/2009/12/interview-of-brad-edwards-space.html

Question: Given proper funding, when is the earliest that you could see the space elevator becoming operational? Answer: Given sufficient funding, I am confident that the space elevator could be up and running within 15 years. There are no insurmountable technical issues to the concept. The show stoppers at this point are funding and support. This is unfortunate given that the space elevator has the potential to reduce the cost of getting to orbit to perhaps $20 per pound, including human passengers. The space elevator, more than any other project or concept, has the capacity to quickly open up the field of space and create a massive space-based industry.

#### Lack of carbon nanotubes aren’t a barrier – plan solves

Bradley Edwards, Physics PhD, Dir. Of Research-Inst. For Scientific Research, 12-1-2009, Interview, Next Big Future, http://nextbigfuture.com/2009/12/interview-of-brad-edwards-space.html

Question: Current nanotubes are not sufficiently strong to be used in a space elevator. How much progress do you anticipate in nanotube technology during the next decade? Answer: Small quantities of some nanotubes have been made that are sufficiently strong to be used in a space elevator. We would obviously need to produce hundreds of tons of such nanotubes to build a space elevator. With sufficient funding, we could create a nanotube-based material appropriate for a space elevator within a couple of years. Question: How much of an improvement is needed from nanotubes? Answer: Nanotubes of lengths up to an inch can already be created. These materials can be bundled together to form arbitrarily long lengths of cable that would be appropriate for a space elevator. So the primary problems at this point are not technical but rather economic and political.

#### Their evidence doesn’t assume that the elevator is built as a ribbon – solves all technical barriers

Bradley Edwards, Physics PhD, Dir. Of Research-Inst. For Scientific Research, 12-1-2009, Interview, Next Big Future, http://nextbigfuture.com/2009/12/interview-of-brad-edwards-space.html

Question: Some critics have claimed that microscopic cracks will propagate through any ribbon at the speed of sound. Answer: The ribbon isn't solid, but rather is composed of 10-40 thousand strands of nanotube fibers. Individual fibers will get broken and recoil, so the ribbon needs to be designed to recoil only short distances. So short lengths of fibers will get broken, but the breaks won't propagate in such way as to destroy the ribbon. The ribbon will unquestionably be hit by micro meteors, and these will damage small areas. But the ribbon will be designed to absorb these areas and still remain fully functional. Question: How difficult will it be for a space elevator to avoid satellites and space debris? Answer: Any debris that is a centimeter or smaller will hit and damage the ribbon. Objects larger than a centimeter will be tracked continuously monitored. The elevator, which will be located in the ocean, will need to be moved approximately once every 14 hours in order to avoid hitting larger debris. So these issues are by no means intractable.

### Inherency – No Space Colonization Now

#### No budgetary support for NASA – exploration will cease in near future.

Matt **Gurney**, member of the National Post editorial board, 12/13/**2010**, “U.S. putting NASA expertise at risk,” National Post, http://fullcomment.nationalpost.com/2010/12/13/matt-gurney-u-s-putting-nasa-expertise-at-risk/

**The Sputnik example is apt.** But **this administration, ably assisted by both parties in Congress, is guaranteeing that, at least in outer space, the United States could not possibly hope to mount that kind of effort again.** **Under** President Obama, **NASA has become an afterthought. There is no plan in place to return to the moon or Mar**s, no manned missions planned to the asteroid belt. **Its current operations are crippled by budgetary doubt** — its budget has not yet been approved and NASA might need a continuing resolution to stay afloat. Depending on the specifics of how the budget is delivered, **NASA could find itself short almost $1.5-billion — an enormous chunk of its relatively tiny budget** of $19-billion. **Worse, after the last shuttle launch** in April of 2011, **America won’t have any manned space ships.** President Obama cancelled the Constellation Program, a $220-billion plan to design new exploration craft capable of travelling beyond Earth’s orbit. Constellation wasn’t perfect, but the President cancelled it without selecting a replacement, instead choosing to outsource the development of astronaut-carrying rockets to the private sector (the first launch of such a prototype successfully put an unmanned test capsule into orbit and returned it safely to Earth last Monday). A powerful new rocket, based on proven technology developed for the shuttle, has been approved, but won’t be ready for years. In the meantime, **NASA’s manned programs will virtually cease, and the commercial flights aren’t pushing any new frontiers**, simply seeking cheaper ways to do what NASA has been doing since 1962.

#### US space exploration dying now.

Jean-Louis **Santini**, Agence France Presse, 4/8/**2011**, “50 years after Gagarin, US space flight sputters,” Yahoo News, <http://news.yahoo.com/s/afp/space50yearsrussiaus>

WASHINGTON (AFP) – Fifty years after Yuri Gagarin became the first man in space, **the US space shuttle program is winding down leaving former rival Russia as the only nation able to carry astronauts into orbit.** After its last shuttle flight set for late June, NASA will count on Russian Soyuz capsules to bring its astronauts to the International Space Station to the tune of $50 million per seat until a new shuttle is ready. **The space shuttle Endeavour is set for its last mission to the ISS in late April, followed by Atlantis in June. The Discovery** wrapped up its final voyage in March and **is headed for retirement in a US museum. A successor for the** 30-year-old shuttle **program is not** officially **expected before 2015, but NASA's chief technologist has admitted it could be a decade before an American space capsule carries astronauts again.** **The next generation of US space flight will be led by the commercial sector**, which has been encouraged by the US government to pursue the creation of new spacecraft and rockets, funded by private business and advised by NASA experts. In addition to seeking a successor to the shuttles, first launched in 1981, **the United States is also pondering the future of human space exploration**. Some are campaigning for Americans -- who were the first to walk on the Moon in 1969 -- to return there, while others are making a push for exploring Mars or an asteroid. "**The future of US human space flight was almost as uncertain (in 1961) as it is today," said** analyst John **Logsdon,** former director of the Space Policy Institute at George Washington University.

#### US will fall behind on space exploration.

Jean-Louis **Santini**, Agence France Presse, 4/8/**2011**, “50 years after Gagarin, US space flight sputters,” Yahoo News, <http://news.yahoo.com/s/afp/space50yearsrussiaus>

**The United States is now not only facing astronomical budget deficits, but the Cold War rivalry with the Soviets has dissipated.** "Today, **a lot of people say that the Chinese are the new rival and I don't think it's the same thing either," Garber said, calling the current US space strategy "very uncertain**." Logsdon agreed, noting that China's human space flight missions have been few and far between. **The real challenge for the US space program is agreeing on a vision for the future**. As of now, the only point most in NASA can agree upon is that experimentation and exploration at the orbiting International Space Station will figure prominently in US space plans for the next decade. "We do need more policy debate otherwise **we are going to be** sort of **floundering," Garber said**.

### Colonization Advantage – Yes Asteroids

#### Asteroid in the near future likely

Gregg Easterbrook, The Atlantic Staff Writer, June 2008, “The Sky Is Falling”, The Atlantic, “http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/200806/asteroids”

Breakthrough ideas have a way of seeming obvious in retro­spect, and about a decade ago, a Columbia University geophysicist named Dallas Abbott had a breakthrough idea. She had been pondering the craters left by comets and asteroids that smashed into Earth. Geologists had counted them and concluded that space strikes are rare events and had occurred mainly during the era of primordial mists. But, Abbott realized, this deduction was based on the number of craters found on land—and because 70 percent of Earth’s surface is water, wouldn’t most space objects hit the sea? So she began searching for underwater craters caused by impacts rather than by other forces, such as volcanoes. What she has found is spine-chilling: evidence that several enormous asteroids or comets have slammed into our planet quite recently, in geologic terms. If Abbott is right, then you may be here today, reading this magazine, only because by sheer chance those objects struck the ocean rather than land. Abbott believes that a space object about 300 meters in diameter hit the Gulf of Carpentaria, north of Australia, in 536 A.D. An object that size, striking at up to 50,000 miles per hour, could release as much energy as 1,000 nuclear bombs. Debris, dust, and gases thrown into the atmosphere by the impact would have blocked sunlight, temporarily cooling the planet—and indeed, contemporaneous accounts describe dim skies, cold summers, and poor harvests in 536 and 537.

#### We wont find asteroids until they are really close.

Dan Vergano, USA Today Staff Writer, 8-12-2009, “Panel: NASA needs to do more to spot killer asteroids”, USA TODAY, “http://www.usatoday.com/tech/science/space/2009-08-12-nasa-asteroids\_N.htm”

[NASA](http://content.usatoday.com/topics/topic/Organizations/Government+Bodies/NASA) is falling well short in its goal to spot huge asteroids that could threaten Earth, and it needs more money and skywatchers to do the job, a science panel said Wednesday. In 2005, Congress asked the space agency to find 90% of all "potentially hazardous" near-Earth asteroids and comets, ones more than 460 feet wide (farther than home plate to deep centerfield in Yankee Stadium), by 2020. Instead, the three current survey efforts dedicated to the problem, supported at current levels, will likely find only about 15%, suggests the National Research Council panel. "For the first time, humanity has the capacity and the audacity to avoid a natural disaster," says Irwin Shapiro of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics (CfA) in Cambridge, Mass., who headed the panel. "It really is a question of how much to invest in an insurance policy for the planet."

#### Asteroid strikes will cause extinction

Gregg Easterbrook, The Atlantic Staff Writer, June 2008, “The Sky Is Falling”, The Atlantic, “http://www.theatlantic.com/doc/200806/asteroids”

These standard assumptions—that remaining space rocks are few, and that encounters with planets were mainly confined to the past—are being upended. On March 18, 2004, for instance, a 30-meter asteroid designated 2004 FH—a hunk potentially large enough to obliterate a city—shot past Earth, not far above the orbit occupied by telecommunications satellites. (Enter “2004 FH” in the search box at Wikipedia and you can watch film of that asteroid passing through the night sky.) Looking at the broader picture, in 1992 the astronomers David Jewitt, of the University of Hawaii, and Jane Luu, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, discovered the Kuiper Belt, a region of asteroids and comets that starts near the orbit of Neptune and extends for immense distances outward. At least 1,000 objects big enough to be seen from Earth have already been located there. These objects are 100 kilometers across or larger, much bigger than whatever dispatched the dinosaurs; space rocks this size are referred to as “planet killers” because their impact would likely end life on Earth. Investigation of the Kuiper Belt has just begun, but there appear to be substantially more asteroids in this region than in the asteroid belt, which may need a new name.

### Colonization Advantage – Space Elevator Key

#### Space elevator is key to enable colonization

Kristin Ohlson, June 2008, “Orbital express,” Cosmos Magazine, http://www.cosmosmagazine.com/features/print/2435/orbital-express?Page=0%2C0OVER%20THE%20DECADES

"THE PATH TO SOLVING many of the Earth's problems is through space," enthuses David Livingston, host and producer of The Space Show, a U.S. radio program focussed on space commerce and tourism, which is heard in 50 countries. "Space is not only of great commercial value, but that's where mankind has always performed [at] its best." Space elevator advocates claim that there are likely to be many more benefits which we can't even imagine until we begin serious exploration of space. As the late Arthur C. Clarke once said, "The analogy I often use is this: if you had intelligent fish arguing about why they should go out on dry land, some bright young fish might have thought of many things, but they would never have thought of fire, and I think that in space we will find things as useful as fire." The space elevator would also make large-scale colonisation of space possible, something that can never be achieved by rockets or shuttles. Imagine the possibilities for developers dreaming of space resorts! And one television network has already called Edwards to ask about the feasibility of doing a Survivor-type show on Mars. Many scientists, including renowned British physicist Stephen Hawking, worry that Earth and much of what lives on it could be wiped out by a disaster such as a rogue virus or severe global warming. They believe the future of the human race depends on moving into space. "The Earth has been hit by a huge asteroid before," says Ted Semon, a retired software engineer who lives near Chicago, USA, and moderates the official Space Elevator Games blog. "If something big comes, there's nothing we can do about it. As the U.S. science-fiction writer Robert Heinlein said, "The Earth is too small and fragile a basket for the human race to keep all its eggs in.'"

#### Space elevator is key to colonization

International Space Elevator Consortium, 2-17-2011, “Why do I want a Space Elevator?” <http://www.isec.org/index.php/resources/space-elevator-basics/why-do-i-want-a-space-elevator>

What kind of specific benefits could we expect to see from a functioning Space Elevator? As with the intercontinental railway, it’s impossible to foretell all of the uses of such an infrastructure, but here are some possibilities. Large scale manufacturing in a zero-g environment. If corporations can build manufacturing facilities in space at an affordable price, they will do so. Right now, the cost and weight penalties are too prohibitive to even consider the idea. A space elevator would change that. Colonization of the moon, Mars and other planets and satellites. Currently, establishing and supplying a 6 or 8 person science station on the moon (let alone Mars or anywhere else) is probably at the very limit of our capabilities. Allowing hundreds (or even thousands) of tons to be launched into space every day would allow us to colonize these other worlds. This would provide an insurance policy for humanity, an outlet for those with a pioneering spirit and, almost certainly, increased benefits here on earth as commerce between our planet and others was established.

#### Space elevator solves colonization

Bradley Edwards, Physics PhD., Dir. Of Research-Inst. For Scientific Research, August 2005, “A Hoist to the Heavens,” IEEE Spectrum, http://spectrum.ieee.org/aerospace/space-flight/a-hoist-to-the-heavens

It sounds like a crazy idea, and indeed the space elevator has been the stuff of science fiction for decades. But if we want to set the stage for the large-scale and sustained exploration and colonization of the planets and begin to exploit solar power in a way that could significantly brighten the world's dimming energy outlook, the space elevator is the only technology that can deliver. It all boils down to dollars and cents, of course. It now costs about US $20 000 per kilogram to put objects into orbit. Contrast that rate with the results of a study I recently performed for NASA, which concluded that a single space elevator could reduce the cost of orbiting payloads to a remarkably low $200 a kilogram and that multiple elevators could ultimately push costs down below $10 a kilogram. With space elevators we could eventually make putting people and cargo into space as cheap, kilogram for kilogram, as airlifting them across the Pacific.

### Colonization Advantage – Colonization Solves Extinction

#### Only space colonization prevents inevitable extinction.

Anders Sandberg, James Martin Research Fellow at the Future of Humanity Institute at Oxford University, Jason G. Matheny, PhD candidate in Health Policy and Management at Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, and Milan M. Ćirković, senior research associate at the Astronomical Observatory of Belgrade, 9/9/2008, “How can we reduce the risk of human extinction?” Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, http://www.thebulletin.org/web-edition/features/how-can-we-reduce-the-risk-of-human-extinction

Other measures to reduce extinction risks may have less in common with strategies to improve global security, generally. Since a species' survivability is closely related to the extent of its range, perhaps the most effective means of reducing the risk of human extinction is to colonize space sooner, rather than later. Citing, in particular, the threat of new biological weapons, Stephen Hawking has said, "I don't think the human race will survive the next thousand years, unless we spread into space. There are too many accidents that can befall life on a single planet." Similarly, NASA Administrator Michael Griffin has noted, "The history of life on Earth is the history of extinction events, and human expansion into the Solar System is, in the end, fundamentally about the survival of the species."

#### Space colonization enables nuclear survival

Fred Koschara, computer programmer, 2001, http://www.l5development.com/fkespace/financial-return.html

Potentially one of the greatest benefits that may be achieved by the space colonies is nuclear survival, and the ability to live past any other types of mass genocide that become available. We have constructed ourselves a house of dynamite, and now live in fear that someone might light a match. If a global nuclear war were to break out, or if a deadly genetic experiment got released into the atmosphere, the entire human race could be destroyed in a very short period of time. In addition, many corporate attitudes seem concerned with only maximizing today's bottom line, with no concern for the future. This outlook leads to dumping amazingly toxic wastes into the atmosphere and oceans, a move which can only bring harm in the long run. Humanity has to diversify its hold in the universe if it is to survive. Only through space colonization is that option available, and we had all best hope we're not to late.

#### Colonization is a moral necessity—it’s the only way to guarantee the long-term survival of life in the universe

Marshall Savage, Founder of the Living Universe Foundation, 1994, The Millenial Project, p. 19-20

Life is too precious a thing in the Cosmos not to be preserved at all costs. It is entirely possible that ours is the only living planet in the universe. Throughout the star clouds of the Milky Way, planets probably teem by the hundreds of millions. But every one may be as dead and sterile as our own moon. Those myriad empty worlds could be just so many particles of barren galactic dust. Yet, out on the margin of this vast slag-heap of stellar debris, there glows a single magic scintilla of blue-green living light. Like a lone incandescent spark in an endless landscape of cinders—this is Gaia. Earth, a single tiny glimmer of Life, utterly and eternally alone. And yet, for all our microscopic insignificance, we have the potential to suffuse our green fire through every granule of the whole lifeless pile. What is such a spark worth do you suppose? How many of the lifeless worlds would you give in exchange for the one living one? It is like asking how much coal ash you would trade for the Hope Diamond. Consider for a moment the implications if we are alone: Then the entire responsibility for Life in the Cosmos is ours to bear. Compared to this duty, the burden of Atlas was nothing. As the sole caretakers of Life it is our sacred duty not only to preserve Life here on Earth, but also to disseminate the magic among the stars. The universe may teem with Life. We don’t know that it doesn’t. Conversely, we don’t know that it does. The bottom line is that as far as we know, this planet holds the only reservoir of Life Force in the Cosmos. Until we find out otherwise, it is incumbent upon us to act as if the Earth is the lone spark in ten billion parsecs of frozen desolation.

### Colonization Advantage – Colonization Not Impossible

#### Technology solves radiation hazards.

Bethany Ehlmann et al, Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Washington University, St. Louis, May/June 2005, “Humans to Mars: A feasibility and cost–benefit analysis,” Acta Astronautica, p.856

Several shielding technologies exist to address radiation challenges. Passive shielding employs no energy but uses an enormous shielding mass of hydrogen in the form of water. This passive shielding unfortunately increases mission costs by increasing payload size. Active shielding methods, which work in much the same way as the Earth’s electromagnetic field by deflecting interstellar charged particles, are promising alternatives but have a failure risk and require energy [20]. A hybrid system combining aspects from both types of shielding optimizes both the level of protection afforded to the crew and the size of the payload mass. Certain types of shielding technology are nearing maturity given what we know about the radiation environment; however, we agree with the recommendations of others [21,22] that further radiation level measurements on Mars’ surface are needed.

#### Current robotic exploration will solve radiation barriers.

Science Daily, 11/9/2010, “Sensor on Mars Rover to Measure Radiation Environment,” http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2010/11/101109152814.htm

The Mars Science Laboratory mission's Radiation Assessment Detector, or RAD, will monitor naturally occurring radiation that can be unhealthful if absorbed by living organisms. It will do so on the surface of Mars, where there has never before been such an instrument, as well as during the trip between Mars and Earth. RAD's measurements on Mars will help fulfill the mission's key goals of assessing whether Curiosity's landing region on Mars has had conditions favorable for life and for preserving evidence about life. This instrument also will do an additional job. Unlike any of the nine others in this robotic mission's science payload, RAD has a special task and funding from the part of NASA that is planning human exploration beyond Earth orbit. It will aid design of human missions by reducing uncertainty about how much shielding from radiation future astronauts will need. The measurements between Earth and Mars, as well as the measurements on Mars, will serve that purpose.

#### Preventive measures solve gravity problems.

Bethany Ehlmann et al, Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Washington University, St. Louis, May/June 2005, “Humans to Mars: A feasibility and cost–benefit analysis,” Acta Astronautica, p.856

In the course of a human mission to Mars, the crew will experience the zero-gravity environment of interplanetary space, the 0.38g environment of Mars, the zero gravity of space on the return trip, and a return to normal Earth gravity. Research on microgravity effects has been conducted using space-based data as well as ground-based simulations like water immersion. Pharmaceuticals, exercise, conditioning, and artificial gravity are promising strategies that mitigate the effects of microgravity on humans in space. Exercise and conditioning are considered effective means of countering the physiological effects of microgravity, though the amount of time devoted to an exercise program must be weighed against time taken away from required dailytasks and functions.

### Stimulus Advantage – Stimulus Key To Growth

#### Collapse coming – fiscal stimulus speeds recovery

Kevin Carmichael, 4-26-2012, “Why the U.S. 'fiscal cliff' matters,” http://www.theglobeandmail.com/report-on-business/economy/economy-lab/daily-mix/why-the-us-fiscal-cliff-matters/article2414865/

As noted in this space on Wednesday, the Federal Reserve is rather troubled about what damage the divided U.S. Congress might cause on the eve of 2013. Revenues are set to jump by some 30 per cent over two years, as temporary tax cuts expire, according to the Congressional Budget Office. At the same time, the $1-trillion in arbitrary spending reductions over ten years that were agreed last year are scheduled to begin. The combination will do wonders for the U.S.’s ugly balance sheet, putting the government on a path to narrow the debt to 65 per cent of gross domestic product by 2020. But the Fed believes this is too much fiscal consolidation at too rapid a pace for the fragile economic recovery to bear. “It’s very important to say that if no action were taken by the fiscal authorities, the size of the fiscal cliff is such that there is, I think, absolutely no chance that the Federal Reserve could or would have any ability whatsoever to offset that effect on the economy,” Fed chairman Ben Bernanke said Wednesday. “As I have said many times before it is imperative for Congress to give us a fiscal policy that achieves two principle objectives. The first is to achieve fiscal sustainability over the longer term. That is critical and something that needs to be addressed. At the same time I think that can be done is a way that doesn’t endanger the short-term recovery of the economy. And I am concerned that if all of the tax increases and spending cuts that are associated with the current law take place…that would be a significant risk to the recovery.” This is more than a matter of concern for the Fed and Mr. Bernanke. The IMF said last week that the fiscal cliff is a threat to U.S. growth that is similar in scale to that posed by the European debt crisis. The Bank of Canada factored for fiscal consolidation in the U.S. equal to four percentage points of GDP between 2012 and 2014, including the winding down of stimulus programs, the ending of temporary tax cuts and the spending reductions agreed as part of the deal last year to raise the debt ceiling. “The projected increase in U.S. real GDP growth between 2013 and 2014 is highly contingent on the expected profile for fiscal policy,” the Bank of Canada says in its latest Monetary Policy Report.

#### Even if growth is happening, it’s slow and risks collapse – stimulus is key

Kevin Hall, 4-27-2012, “Weak growth of U.S. economy in first quarter renews fears of stalled recovery,” http://www.bellinghamherald.com/2012/04/27/2499049/us-economy-slows-to-22-percent.html#storylink=cpy

The U.S. economy’s weaker-than-expected growth in the first three months of this year renewed concerns Friday that the nation’s fragile recovery might stall. Much of the drag against growth reported Friday came from falling government spending, which raises the stakes in the difficult political fight ahead over narrowing federal budget deficits and lowering the national debt. The U.S. economy expanded at a sluggish 2.2 percent annual rate from January through March, the Commerce Department said. Most forecasters had expected growth in the 2.5 to 3 percent range. Although the headline number for the gross domestic product – the sum of goods and services produced in the U.S. economy – came up short of expectations, the report’s component parts offered rays of hope. Consumption remained strong in a recovering private sector, and the long-troubled housing sector appeared to be rising from the doldrums. Still, the broader GDP number was dragged down by a 3 percent drop in government spending during the first quarter, driven by an 8.1 percent decline in defense spending.

#### New jump-start key to fast growth

Chandra Shobhana, 4-27-2012, “Consumer Spending Drives First-Quarter U.S. Growth: Economy,” SF Gate, http://www.sfgate.com/cgi-bin/article.cgi?f=/g/a/2012/04/27/bloomberg\_articlesM351E03T6SRK01-M35O1.DTL

The U.S. economy expanded less than forecast in the first quarter as the biggest gain in consumer spending in more than a year failed to overcome a diminished contribution from business inventories. Gross domestic product, the value of all goods and services produced in the U.S., rose at a 2.2 percent annual rate after a 3 percent pace, Commerce Department figures showed today in Washington. The median projection of economists surveyed by Bloomberg News called for a 2.5 percent gain. Government spending fell for a sixth straight quarter. Job creation and income gains were enough to propel sales at car dealerships and retailers like Target Corp., helping shore up the U.S. economy in the face of weakness overseas. Further gains in consumer spending will depend on progress in reducing an unemployment rate that has hovered above 8 percent since early 2009. "Consumers are remarkably stable and steady," said Julia Coronado, chief economist for North America at BNP Paribas in New York, who correctly estimated first-quarter GDP. "We'll need to see final demand continue to improve. We're still in muddling-along territory."

### Stimulus Advantage – AT: Stimulus Bad

#### Stimulus was the reason 08 didn’t turn into a depression – more is key to promote sustainable growth

Aaron Task, 3-15-2012, “U.S. Economy Needs More Fiscal Stimulus: Christina Romer Defends Keynesian Economics,” http://finance.yahoo.com/blogs/daily-ticker/u-economy-needs-more-fiscal-stimulus-not-less-120516082.html

"I have no doubt without the actions President Obama took and actions Chairman Bernanke and the Fed took we would be in a much, much worse situation," says Christina Romer, former chair of President Obama's Council of Economic Advisers. "This had all of the makings of terrible depression and the fact we are struggling but coming out is a tribute to the President's policies." Specifically, Romer says the Recovery Act and other measures taken by the administration "made a difference, helped to strengthen growth and bring down the unemployment rate." Of course, Romer was one of the architects of those policies and, according to multiple reports, lobbied for even more stimulus than the $800 billion package signed in 2009. True to form, Romer is still lobbying for more and is an ardent believer in the power of fiscal stimulus, a.k.a. Keynesian economics. "I absolutely think more fiscal stimulus would be very helpful," she says. "We need faster growth [to bring down unemployment]. Fiscal stimulus could help do that." Notably, Romer believes short-term stimulus should be tied to long-term plans to bring down the deficit, the huge growth of which -- along with the more recent rise in gas prices -- explains a lot of the public's displeasure with Obama's economic policies. Unfortunately, there is little indication "of Congress being willing to go along with that very sensible, rational policy - what would be effective and what the economy needs," Romer laments. Such views are clearly in the minority in Washington and much of the economic punditry these days is seemingly dedicated to the notion that more government spending to help boost the economy -- a.k.a. Keynesianism -- is the absolute wrong prescription. (See: Europe's "Going in the Wrong Direction," Forbes Says: "The Worst of Both Worlds") But Romer dismisses and (politely) challenges the skeptics. "Fiscal stimulus absolutely can and does help the economy," she says, citing "unbiased" academic research and recent history. "Countries that did more stimulus in 2009 recovered more quickly from the downturn than those that did less," Romer declares.

#### Evaluate stimulus based on specificity

Paul Krugman, Professor at LSE, 3-17-2012, “The Future Is Another Country,” http://krugman.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/03/17/the-future-is-another-country/

Nor, as Wren-Lewis says, is there any good reason to believe that fiscal austerity now will persist when times are better. A prime example is what happened to the de facto austerity of the 1990s, when spending restraint in the face of a booming economy finally moved the US government into surplus. Without a moment’s hesitation, George W. Bush rushed to squander that hard-won surplus on tax cuts and an unfunded war. To a first approximation, in other words, the effect of current fiscal policy — whether stimulus or austerity — an the actions of future governments is zero. And what that means is that stimulus and/or austerity should be considered on their direct merits, a comparison that makes a strong case for stimulus while revealing austerity as a (literally) unmitigated disaster.

### Stimulus Advantage – AT: Stimulus Bad

#### Double-dip is coming – reversing fiscal austerity is key to avoid collapse

Robert Kuttner, MS in Economics from the London School of Economics, Senior Research Fellow @ Demos, Founder of the American Prospect, 4-1-2012, “Recipe for a Double-Dip Recession,” http://www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-kuttner/double-dip-recession\_b\_1395455.html

With the economy just barely on a path to durable recovery, some very dumb fiscal chickens are coming home to roost on January 1 of next year. This grim coincidence is known as the Triple Witching Hour. First, the legacy of last summer's ill-fated bipartisan fiscal bargain -- an automatic set of budget cuts totaling $1.2 trillion -- kicks in next January 1. Second, President Obama's temporary payroll tax cuts expire. And third -- this is a good witch -- all of President George W. Bush's tax cuts sunset. Just for good measure, there is yet another witch. The temporary extension of the debt ceiling will also expire around the first of the year, giving the deficit hawks of both parties even more leverage. The trouble is that all of this adds up to a massive fiscal contraction. If you want to snuff out a fragile recovery, there is no better way than to cut spending and otherwise shrink the federal deficit prematurely. If anything, the economy needs more public spending for at least a year or two to compensate for the hit to private purchasing power and the housing collapse. The failed grand bargain of last summer was the result of the Republicans holding hostage the extension of authority to roll over the national debt. President Obama was very close to making a bargain that included cuts in Social Security and Medicare in exchange for some very modest tax increases. House Speaker John Boehner, mercifully, refused to take the deal. So the two parties agreed on automatic triggers. Following the election, there will be tremendous pressure on Congress and the White House to re-open the deal. With a Republican president, the bargain could get even worse--smaller cuts in military spending, more cuts in domestic spending, and extension of the Bush tax cuts and other tax breaks. If President Obama wins and brings a Democratic Congress with him, the Democrats should revisit not just the composition of the deal but the premise that we need big cuts in the deficit next year or two. Interest rates have never been lower. This is the time for the Federal government to borrow a lot of money and to invest it in public improvements -- not as a one-shot but as a multi-year program that does not have to be instantly shovel-ready. The trouble with using deficit-reduction and ten-year debt goals as a recovery strategy is that the future deficit is itself a function of the growth rate. Squeeze too tightly, and economic growth slows down. Even though you cut spending, the deficit actually widens. This is the real lesson of Greece.

### Launches Advantage – Launches Hurts Ozone

#### The risk posed by space launches outweighs other causes of ozone destruction

Lewis Page, Register Space Staff, 4-1-2009, “Space launches could be capped to save ozone layer,” The Register, pg. A6

American researchers have warned that space rockets could do more damage to the ozone layer than old-school spray-cans and fridges. "As the rocket launch market grows, so will ozone-destroying rocket emissions," said Professor Darin Toohey, atmosphere and ocean scientist at Colorado Uni. "If left unregulated, rocket launches by the year 2050 could result in more ozone destruction than was ever realized by CFCs." Chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) were banned from use in aerosol cans, freezer refrigerants and air conditioners by the Montreal Protocol in 1987. Some scientists believe that the upper-atmosphere ozone layer - which protects the Earth's surface from harmful solar ultraviolet - will return to normal by 2040 as a result. But Toohey and his collaborators say the potential damage caused by rocket exhaust has been ignored. "The Montreal Protocol has left out the space industry, which could have been included," says the prof.

#### The effects are immediate – and have negative long-term ramifications

Martin Ross, PhD from UCLA in Earth and Planetary Sciences, and Paul Zittel, PhD in Physical Chemistory, 6-2000, “Rockets and the Ozone Layer,” AeroSpace, http://www.aero.org/publications/crosslink/summer2000/01.html

Rocket emissions have two distinct effects on ozone: short-term and long-term. Following launch, rapid chemical reactions between plume gases and particles and ambient air that has been drawn into the plume wake cause immediate changes in the composition of the local atmosphere. During this phase, which lasts for several hours, the concentrations of radicals in the plume can be thousands of times greater than the concentrations found in the undisturbed stratosphere, and the ozone loss is dramatic. Long-term effects occur as gas and particulate emissions from individual launches become dispersed throughout the global stratosphere and accumulate over time. The concentrations of emitted compounds reach an approximate global steady state as exhaust from recent launches replaces exhaust removed from the stratosphere by natural atmospheric circulation.

#### New space missions devastate the ozone

Doug Messier, Space Analyst, 4-7-2009, “Space Tourism Threat: Less Carbon Emissions Than Ozone Depletion?,” Parabolic Arc, http://www.parabolicarc.com/2009/04/07/space-tourism-threat-carbon-emissions-ozone-depletion/

The frequent launches of space rockets are harming the protective ozone layer of Earth – that’s what the US atmospheric researchers have warned in their recent study. The scientists have cautioned and advised that the space missions should be restricted as rocket launches are damaging the stratospheric ozone layer.

### Launches Advantage – Ozone Depletion Bad

#### Ozone depletion leads to cancer and hurts biodiversity

William Thomas, Investigative Journalist, 8-7-2006, “Scientist Says Chemtrails, Shuttle Launches Endangering Earth,” Chem Trails, http://www.chemtrails911.com/docs/Space%20Shuttle%20Launch-Ozone%20Layer.htm

The UN environment program estimates that for every 1% thinning of the ozone layer there is a 2% to 3% rise in skin cancer. It can also cause cataracts--even if dark glasses are worn. Since some species are more vulnerable than others, an increase in UV exposure has the potential to cause a shift in species composition and reduce diversity in ecosystems. Excess UV radiation cuts photosynthesis in plants, reducing the size and yield of winter wheat and other crops. Over half of all new cancers are skin cancers. One person dies of melanoma every hour. More than 1 million new cases of skin cancer were diagnosed in the United States in 2004. The incidence of melanoma more than tripled among Caucasians between 1980 and 2003. [Rachel’s Jan 5/87]

#### Ozone depletion tanks phytoplankton – leads to carbon spikes

William Thomas, Investigative Journalist, 8-7-2006, “Scientist Says Chemtrails, Shuttle Launches Endangering Earth,” Chem Trails, http://www.chemtrails911.com/docs/Space%20Shuttle%20Launch-Ozone%20Layer.htm

Onboard a plant that is mostly seawater, the microscopic plants that underpin all life in the oceans are being starved as global warming halts the vital up welling of nutrients from the deep sea. Now, increased solar radiation streaming through the holes left rocket launches and airline flights are also frying the oceanic plankton that provide most of our spaceship’s oxygen, while scrubbing huge amounts of carbon out of the atmosphere. “Reducing the world's populations of phytoplankton would significantly impact the world's carbon cycle,” warns the Guardian, by leaving more carbon in the air. [Independent Jan 19/06; Guardian Apr 27/05]

#### Ozone depletion effects all areas of the food chain – drastically changes biodiversity

Chandramita Bora, MA in Economics, 2010, “Ozone Layer Depletion: Effects and Causes of Ozone Depletion,” Buzzle, http://www.buzzle.com/articles/ozone-layer-depletion-effects-and-causes-of-ozone-depletion.html

The effects of ozone depletion are not limited to humans only, as it can affect animals and plants as well. It can affect important food crops like rice by adversely affecting cyanobacteria, which helps them absorb and utilize nitrogen properly. Phytoplankton, an important component of the marine food chain, can also be affected by ozone depletion. Studies in this regard have shown that ultraviolet rays can influence the survival rates of these microscopic organisms by affecting their orientation and mobility.

### Launches Advantage – Launches 🡪 Debris

#### Each new launch risks space debris

Victoria Jaggard, National Geographic News Writer, 3-28-2010, “Tiny Solar Sail Pitched to Clean Up Space Junk,” National Geographic, http://newswatch.nationalgeographic.com/2010/03/28/tiny\_solar\_sail\_pitched\_to\_cle/

Collisions with even a small speck can damage working satellites or harm spacewalkers. And larger pieces left up there will eventually come down, creating potential hazards if they do not completely disintegrate during reentry. Not to mention that space junk is only increasing with each new launch—some experts say at a rate of 5 percent a year. That much clutter invariably blocks communications signals, making it harder to get reliable data streams from satellites surrounded by junk.

#### Every launch risks new space junk

Atlanta Journal-Constitution, 2-27-2006, “Final frontier littered with junk,” Atlanta-Journal Constitution, pg. A6

In 2002, when U.S. shuttle astronauts changed out the solar panels on the Hubble Space Telescope and returned them to Earth for examination, engineers found them riddled with thousands of impact craters including 174 punctures none of them bigger than a BB. A speeding paint chip gouged a pit in one of the space shuttle's windows in 1983. Gravity, of course, eventually brings most of the junk back to terra firma. But each new launch adds to the problem. And as things collide and proliferate, space junk is becoming a self-renewing nuisance.

#### We are at critical mass – new launches risk collisional cascading

Steve Olson, Author of Space Junk, 1998, “The Danger of Space Junk,” The Atlantic, http://www.theatlantic.com/past/docs/issues/98jul/junk.htm

Eventually the number of explosions will diminish, but by then spacecraft will be breaking up for another reason. As more objects go into orbit, spacecraft will begin colliding with -- and being shattered by -- debris. Furthermore, collisions beget more collisions. This process is known as collisional cascading, or the Kessler effect, after Donald Kessler, recently retired from his post as the head of the debris program at NASA. In the 1970s Kessler showed mathematically that once a certain amount of mass, known as the critical mass, is put into a particular orbit, collisional cascading begins even if no more objects are launched into that orbit. Originally dismissed as a mathematical fantasy, Kessler's prediction is on the verge of coming true. In the most popular orbits, Kessler says, "if we're not at the critical mass, we're pretty close to it."

### Launches Advantage – Debris Kills Economy

#### Space disruption collapses the global economy

Thierry Sénéchal, PhD from Columbia University, 2007, “Space Debris Pollution: A Convention Proposal,” Protocol for a Space Debris Risk and Liability Convention, http://www.pon.org/downloads/ien16.2.Senechal.pdf

An Increasing Space Market with Higher Risks of Economic Disruptions The market for commercial space launchers has witnessed rapid growth over the past several years. If more space debris accumulates, the business is at risk. Today, more and more activities rely on well functioning communication equipment in space. Any disruption can have major consequential losses. World geopolitics has dramatically changed since the 1960‘s race to the moon. At the time, the U.S. and the Soviet Union competed with one another, both on Earth and in space.

#### Space junk effects all key space assets

The Telegraph, 2-1-2011, “What is space junk and why should we be worried?,” The Telegraph, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/science/space/8295958/What-is-space-junk-and-why-should-we-be-worried.html

Space junk is the term used to describe man-made rubbish floating in space – often litter from space exploration, including spanners, nuts, bolts, gloves and shards of space craft. - The majority of the debris in space is believed to consist of small particles but some objects are larger, including spent rocket stages, defunct satellites and collision fragments. - As many as ten million pieces of human-made debris are estimated to be circulating in space at any one time. - Experts believe that global positioning systems, international phone connections, television signals and weather forecasts could be affected by increasing levels of space junk.

#### Increasing space debris collapses the global economy

Megan Ansdell, Graduate Student @ GWU, 2010, “Active Space Debris Removal,” Princeton Publications, http://www.princeton.edu/jpia/past-issues-1/2010/Space-Debris-Removal.pdf

It is likely that space debris will become a signiﬁcant problem within the next several decades. Predictive studies show that if humans do not take action to control the space debris population, an increasing number of unintentional collisions between orbiting objects will lead to the runaway growth of space debris in Earth’s orbit (Liou and Johnson 2006). This uncontrolled growth of space debris threatens the ability of satellites to deliver the services humanity has come to rely on in its day-to-day activities. For example, Global Positioning System (GPS) precision timing and navigation signals are a signiﬁcant component of the modern global economy; a GPS failure could disrupt emergency response services, cripple global banking systems, and interrupt electric power grids (Logsdon 2001).

### Solvency – Space Elevator Feasible

#### Technology will exist by 2013

The Economist, 6-8-2006, “Waiting for the space elevator,” http://www.economist.com/node/7001786

FOR decades science-fiction writers and engineers have dreamed of building a lift from the Earth's surface into space. Konstantin Tsiolkovsky, a Russian scientist, suggested a similar idea more than a century ago, and in 1979 Arthur C. Clarke wrote an entire novel, “The Fountains of Paradise”, about the construction of a space elevator. Whisking satellites, space probes and even people into orbit on a giant elevator appears far more civilised than expensive, unreliable rockets. Now this fanciful dream is taking its first tentative steps towards reality. Two companies, LiftPort and X-Tech Projects, have been founded to pursue commercial space-elevator projects, and America's space agency, NASA, has provided a $400,000 prize-fund for an annual competition, the Space Elevator Challenge, to encourage space-elevator research. At this year's contest, to be held in October, 21 teams will test their designs for cables, and robotic lifts to climb up them. The concept of a space elevator is simple enough. An orbiting satellite is linked to the surface of the Earth by a cable, which vehicles then climb up and down. However, to reach a satellite in geostationary orbit—which takes exactly a day to circle the Earth, and so seems to hover above a single spot on the equator—the cable would have to be nearly 35,800km (22,250 miles) long. Such a cable would have to be phenomenally strong and light to support its own weight. It has long been recognised that carbon nanotubes, tiny molecular-scale threads of carbon atoms, would be strong enough to build such a cable. (Even though nanotubes were discovered only in 1991, Dr Clarke suggested something very similar in his book: a “hyperfilament” made of “pseudo-one-dimensional diamond crystal”.) But it is not yet possible to produce nanotubes in sufficient quantity, or to knit them into a rope with anything like the strength of the tiny, individual tubes. So far, the strongest commercially available fibre of the required weight is around 4% as strong as a space elevator would require, says Ben Shelef, co-founder of the Spaceward Foundation, which runs the space-elevator competition. He notes that if researchers can increase the strength of that fibre by 50% a year, they will produce a fibre strong enough by 2013. Such speedy progress is not unusual in a new field.

#### Lift technology isn’t a barrier to the space elevator

The Economist, 6-8-2006, “Waiting for the space elevator,” http://www.economist.com/node/7001786

The next problem is to work out how to power the lifts, which will take several days to make the long trip into orbit. Carrying fuel or batteries on board would be impractical, as this would add massively to the weight of the lift, and reduce its carrying capacity. So both LiftPort and X-Tech are designing climbing modules equipped with solar panels that receive power from a laser beamed from the ground. The technology to make this possible is still under development, but compared with the challenges posed by the cable, it's straightforward, says Mr Shelef. Then there is the danger of orbiting space debris left over from decades of launches, which could damage or destroy the cable. Mr Shelef proposes using radar to detect chunks of debris before a collision, and then steering the cable around them. Fixing the bottom of the cable to an ocean-going platform would make it easy to move, he suggests.

#### The tech for a space elevator has already been demonstrated

The Economist, 6-8-2006, “Waiting for the space elevator,” http://www.economist.com/node/7001786

If these problems can be overcome, building a space elevator is expected to cost around $10 billion—a modest sum by the standards of space exploration. LiftPort estimates that satellites could be launched at around one thousandth of the cost of using rockets. But NASA is sceptical, despite supporting the space-elevator competition. “Since the basic material has yet to be developed, it is still in the research phase and is not a current programme at NASA,” says a spokesman. In February LiftPort conducted one of the most elaborate space-elevator tests so far. Hot-air balloons secured a cable in place for six hours, and robots then climbed up and down it. The cable reached only a mile into the sky, it is true. But engineers have, in effect, pressed the “call” button—though as so often when waiting for a lift, there is now likely to be a long wait until it arrives.

### Solvency – Space Elevator Lowers Launch Costs

#### Space elevator lowers launch costs

Bradley Edwards, Physics PhD., Dir. Of Research-Inst. For Scientific Research, 2006, Leaving the Planet by Space Elevator, p. 161-2

The reason, then, to use a Space Elevator to go into space, is that it changes the rules dramatically and reduces the cost to an economic level. The Space Elevator is a disruptive technology. Disruptive technologies are not gradual change. They rewrite the ground rules. If you are playing the old game of “rockets” you are out of it when an elevator offers launch capacity with a “98% off’ sale tag. Disruptive technologies are the key to changes in nation strengths. Steam engines gave Britain its power in the Industrial Revolution and turned it prom an average European Country into a world power for a time. Cars and airplanes were the disruptive technologies at the start of the 20” Century. Cell phones mean newly developing countries can leapfrog landline phone systems. By the end of the 21’s Century the Space Elevator will have transformed our society and space travel.

#### Space elevator solves launch costs

International Space Elevator Consortium, 2-17-2011, “Why do I want a Space Elevator?” <http://www.isec.org/index.php/resources/space-elevator-basics/why-do-i-want-a-space-elevator>

What does a space elevator give us? In a nutshell, a Space Elevator provides us with a superior method to ship cargo (and eventually humans) into space. Right now, if you want to ship anything into space, you must use rockets. This will cost you several thousands of dollars per kilogram, the cargo will be subjected to severe ‘shake, rattle and roll’ and g-stress forces and you have to settle for a launch ‘success’ ratio in the 90-97% range (depending on which specific launch vehicle you’re talking about). Rockets also generate a tremendous amount of pollution. This is inherent with rockets. We’ve had lots of really smart people spending lots and lots of money developing rocket technology over the past several decades and this is the best they can do, and, due to the rocket equation, probably getting close to the best they ever can do. If you want to ship large quantities of anything into space, and you want to do so cheaply (relatively speaking to rockets) and reliably, you need to change the equation. Instead of using rockets, build a transportation infrastructure, a ‘railway line’ into space, Before the intercontinental railway was built, shipping humans and cargo between the east coast and west coast of America required a dangerous overland trip or else the use of ships to transport goods around the tip of South America. You could certainly do it, but it was expensive, often dangerous, and the amount of cargo was limited. The intercontinental railway changed all of that. Travel and Commerce between the eastern and western halves of America exploded now that there was a safe, reliable, and inexpensive way to ship large quantities of goods back and forth. As the intercontinental railway opened up all of America to the vast majority of her citizens, a Space Elevator, a ‘carbon railway to outer space’, will open up space to a much larger part of corporate and private America than is possible today.

#### Space elevator is key to solve launch costs

Kristin Ohlson, June 2008, “Orbital express,” Cosmos Magazine, http://www.cosmosmagazine.com/features/print/2435/orbital-express?Page=0%2C0OVER%20THE%20DECADES

BEYOND THE LOVE OF GADGETS, people are drawn to this project because they believe it will fundamentally change humanity's interaction with the rest of the universe. In the past, this interaction has been limited by the inherent flaws of rocket propulsion: enormously expensive to build and send into space, and the fuel needed to propel them into space leaves hardly any room for cargo. "Most people don't realise how difficult it is to send an object into space," says Barbara Thompson, a NASA scientist who studies solar physics and space weather in Maryland, USA. "The rocket equations are a real eye-opener to [new] engineers. It adds up to high costs to send even small amounts of mass into orbit." Even sending 500 g of cargo into space using rockets costs about US$10,000. A space elevator would reduce this cost dramatically. "It will take shipments almost down to a FedEx price," quips Edwards. "Sending a package into space will cost about as much as sending one from Seattle to South Africa."

### Space Tourism Add-On

#### Space elevator would enable space tourism

Bradley Edwards, Physics PhD., Dir. Of Research-Inst. For Scientific Research, August 2005, “A Hoist to the Heavens,” IEEE Spectrum, http://spectrum.ieee.org/aerospace/space-flight/a-hoist-to-the-heavens

A host of other long-standing space dreams would also become affordable, from asteroid mining to tourism. Some of these would depend on other space-transportation technologies for hauling people and cargo past the elevator's last stop in high-Earth orbit. But physics dictates that the bulk of the cost is dominated by the price of getting into orbit in the first place. For example, 95 percent of the mass of each mighty Saturn V moon rocket was used up just getting into low-Earth orbit. As science-fiction author Robert A. Heinlein reportedly said: "Once you get to Earth orbit, you're halfway to anywhere in the solar system." With the huge cost penalty of traveling between Earth and orbit drastically reduced, it would actually be possible to quarry mineral-rich asteroids and return the materials to Earth for less than what it now costs, in some cases, to rip metal ores out of Earth's crust and then refine them. Tourism, too, could finally arrive on the high frontier: a zero-gravity vacation in geostationary orbit, with the globe spread out in a ceaselessly changing panoply below, could finally become something that an average person could experience. And for the more adventurous, the moon and Mars could become the next frontier.

#### Space tourism solves extinction from nuclear war

Patrick Collins, economics prof, and Adriano Autino, founder of Andromeda Inc., 2009, Acta Astronautica, “What the growth of a space tourism industry could contribute to employment, economic growth, environmental protection, education, culture, and world peace,” p. np

Success of such extra-terrestrial settlements will have the additional benefit of reducing the danger of human extinction due to planet-wide or cosmic accidents [27]. These horrors include both man-made disasters such as nuclear war, plagues or growing pollution, and natural disasters such as super-volcanoes or asteroid impact.It is hard to think of any objective that is more important than preserving peace. Weapons developed in recent decades are so destructive, and have such horrific, long-term side- effects that their use should be discouraged as strongly as possible by the international community. Hence, reducing the incentive to use these weapons by rapidly developing the ability to use space-based resources on a large scale is surely equally important [11,16]. The achievement of this depends on low space travel costs which, at the present time, appear to be achievable only through the development of a vigorous space tourism industry.

#### Space tourism allows space colonization

Al Globus, senior research associate @ San Jose State, 8-1-2008, “Space Tourism Leads to Space Settlement,” National Space Society, http://www.nss.org/tourism/settlement.htm

Space tourism may lead to large numbers of people traveling to space in the next few decades. Burt Rutan, the technical genius behind SpaceShipOne, made a prediction in a 2004 talk in San Jose, CA: Within 5 years 3,000 tourists will have been to space. Within 15 years sub-orbital tourism will be affordable, and 50,000 people will have flown. Within 15 years the first, expensive orbital tourist flights will have happened. Within 25 years orbital tourism will be affordable.Space settlement has tremendous potential benefits for mankind but requires a much more robust and inexpensive launch capacity than is available today. Traditional approaches to improving launch have failed to deliver a sufficiently capable system over the last few decades and shows little promise of doing so. To address this issue, we propose orienting launch development towards the tourist market, which, at the right price, is large enough to support tens of thousands of flights per year. Just as computers once cost millions of dollars and were only available to the few, space tourism today is the province of the wealthy. However, as the cost of computers plunged, they have become part of everyday life for the world’s middle-class. Space tourism promises to do something similar for personal space flight. Just as one day millions of years ago life, for whatever reason, crawled out of the oceans and onto dry land, space tourism may well begin the spread of life throughout our solar system.

### Space Solar Power Add-On

#### Space elevator enables space solar power

Bradley Edwards, Physics PhD., Dir. Of Research-Inst. For Scientific Research, August 2005, “A Hoist to the Heavens,” IEEE Spectrum, http://spectrum.ieee.org/aerospace/space-flight/a-hoist-to-the-heavens

The implications of such a dramatic reduction in the cost of getting to Earth orbit are startling. It's a good bet that new industries would blossom as the resources of the solar system became accessible as never before. Take solar power: the idea of building giant collectors in orbit to soak up some of the sun's vast power and beam it back to Earth via microwaves has been around for decades. But the huge size of the collectors has made the idea economically unfeasible with launch technologies based on chemical rockets. With a space elevator's much cheaper launch costs, however, the economics of space-based solar power start looking good.

#### Space Elevator would solve reliance on fossil fuels

Kristin Ohlson, June 2008, “Orbital express,” Cosmos Magazine, http://www.cosmosmagazine.com/features/print/2435/orbital-express?Page=0%2C0OVER%20THE%20DECADES

With this ability to move massive amounts of material and equipment into space, the possibilities for innovation become limitless. We could assemble and deploy huge solar panels to absorb the Sun's energy, without interference from our atmosphere, and then beam it back to Earth for an infinite supply of clean energy. Some scientists believe this would end our reliance on fossil fuels – for electricity, at least. The space elevator could also open the door for mining valuable minerals on the Moon and on asteroids. And it could enable us to send out sophisticated weather-monitoring satellites to study the physics and chemistry of our atmosphere much more cheaply and frequently.

#### Reliance on fossil fuels will result in a global energy shortage and large resource wars

Space Energy, 2010, “SBSP: Filling a Critical Gap,” http://spaceenergy.com/About/WhySpaceEnergy.htm

It is an indisputable fact that global energy usage is at record high and continuing to rise fast. Demand in several areas of the global economy is already outpacing supply. Traditional hydrocarbon energy reserves are depleting at an ever increasing rate and most experts agree that there is only enough proven uranium reserves to last one more generation. In addition, the use of hydrocarbon and nuclear fuels are widely acknowledged to be leading contributors to significant environmental and health problems. As developing countries continue to grow and embank on major electrification efforts, energy shortages will become one of the most serious challenges facing governments this century. China and India alone will need to raise energy generating capacity by a staggering 4 to 5 times over the next 20 years in order to meet demand – an equivalent of bringing on-line two large coal-fired power stations per week, every week. The risk of energy shortages could mean more than high prices. In the 20th century, many wars were motivated in part by the need to secure future energy supplies - and, according to the U.S. Pentagon, the risk of such conflict remains high in the 21st century. (See the paper "War Without Oil.") Safe, reliable, renewable, base-load power that is affordable and widely available has long been the ‘holy grail’ of researchers and scientists in the energy industry. Aside from averting conflict associated with resource wars, abundant clean energy has the potential to truly improve life around the world in many ways. Rural electrification can offer one of the fastest ways out of poverty for developing areas. It can ensure that food and medicines are preserved and made available where they are needed the most. It can provide power for water purification and desalination and light so that children can study and develop their potential. This is why Space Energy is committed to harnessing existing and new methods for clean energy generation and transmission, such as from ground-based solar power and space-based solar power.

### AT: Politics DA – Plan Popular

#### Spending on space projects is bipartisan – empirically proven.

Kenneth Chang, Staff Writer, 4/15/2010, “Obama Vows Renewed Space Program,” New York Times, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/16/science/space/16nasa.html

Whether appeals for loyalty from Democrats would succeed in gaining Congressional support is unclear. NASA has traditionally received strong support from both political parties, and the opposition to Mr. Obama’s plans has also been bipartisan. Ms. Kosmas, for example, is a co-sponsor of a bill to extend operations of the space shuttles, and Mr. Nelson has pushed for continued work on Constellation rockets as precursors to a heavy-lift rocket. “I’m encouraged,” Mr. Nelson said, although he said he would continue pushing to continue development of the Constellation rockets.

#### Bipartisan support for building in space

Michael Griffin, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, 1/18/2007, “Why Explore Space?” http://www.nasa.gov/exploration/home/griffin\_why\_explore.html

President Bush responded to the Columbia report. The administration looked at where we had been in space and concluded that we needed to do more, to go further. The result was the Vision for Space Exploration, announced nearly three years ago, which commits the United States to using the shuttle to complete the space station, then retiring the shuttle and building a new generation of spacecraft to venture out into the solar system. Congress has ratified that position with an overwhelming bipartisan majority, making the Vision for Space Exploration the law of the land.

#### Bipartisan commitment to space projects – opposition to cuts proves.

Frank Wolf, US Representative from Virginia, 7/15/2010, “Adoption of NASA compromise means continued leadership in space exploration,” The Hill, http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/technology/109109-adoption-of-nasa-compromise-means-continued-leadership-in-space-exploration-rep-frank-wolf

In a rare victory for bipartisanship and the legislative branch, Congress has rallied behind an important compromise plan to ensure continued American leadership in space. Six months after the release of the president’s budget — which effectively mothballed NASA’s exploration program — the Senate and House have sent a clear signal to the White House that such cuts are unacceptable. Last month, I joined Reps. Dutch Ruppersberger (D-Md.), John Culberson (R-Texas), Gene Green (D-Texas) and 58 other bipartisan members representing 18 states on a letter to President Obama detailing a compromise plan centering on the immediate development of a “heavy lift rocket” and crew capsule capable of exploring beyond low Earth orbit, something the U.S. has not done since the Apollo era.

### AT: Elections DA – Plan Popular

#### Public loves the plan – they like spending money on space

Jeremy Hsu, Senior writer for Space.com, 1/13/2011, “The Myth of America's Love Affair with the Moon,” http://www.space.com/10601-apollo-moon-program-public-support-myth.html

The good news for space exploration in general is that public opinion favors it – but only when not taking economic costs and budgetary spending into consideration. "When you divorce it from the numbers and you ask people if they like NASA and spaceflight, people say yes," Launius told SPACE.com. "75 to 80 percent are in favor." The space historian examined nationally representative polls done by industry people and Gallup that asked the same consistent questions year after year. He also looked at polls conducted by the New York Times and others. Public support for overall space funding has hovered around 80 percent in favor of the status quo since 1965, except for a major dip in support during the early 1970s. That may bode well for NASA's continued existence, but it also suggests that few people are clamoring to throw even more money at the space agency.

#### Public support for NASA is strong and resilient.

Jeffrey M. Jones, Gallup, 7/17/2009, “Majority of Americans Say Space Program Costs Justified,” Gallup, http://www.gallup.com/poll/121736/majority-americans-say-space-program-costs-justified.aspx

Americans remain broadly supportive of space exploration and government funding of it. In fact, Americans are somewhat more likely to believe the benefits of the space program justify its costs at the 40th anniversary of the moon landing than they were at the 10th, 25th, and 30th anniversaries. Although support for keeping NASA funding at its present level or increasing it is lower now than it has been in the past, the fact that 6 in 10 Americans hold this view in the midst of a recession suggests the public is firmly committed to the space program.

#### Public supports NASA spending – new polls prove.

Jeffrey M. Jones, Gallup, 7/17/2009, “Majority of Americans Say Space Program Costs Justified,” Gallup, http://www.gallup.com/poll/121736/majority-americans-say-space-program-costs-justified.aspx

PRINCETON, NJ -- On the eve of the 40th anniversary of the U.S. moon landing, a majority of Americans say the space program has brought enough benefits to justify its costs. The percentage holding this view is now at 58% and has increased over time. Notably, those old enough to remember the historic moon landing are actually somewhat less likely than those who are younger to think the space program's costs are justified. Among Americans aged 50 and older (who were at least 10 years old when the moon landing occurred), 54% think the space program's benefits justify its costs, compared with 63% of those aged 18-49. The July 10-12 Gallup Poll also finds that most Americans continue to express support for the current level of funding for NASA (46%) or an expansion of it (14%). But the 60% holding these views is on the low end of what Gallup has measured since 1984, when the question was first asked.

### AT: Private CP – Doesn’t Solve

#### Private industry can’t solve the space elevator – too risky

Dr. David Raitt, senior officer @ European Space Agency, and Dr. Bradley Edwards, President X Tech Corp, 2004, “The Space Elevator: Economics and Applications,”

The private sector alone cannot usually finance and build these massive infrastructure megaprojects because risks are too great and the return is too small. They need to be either joint public-private partnership ventures, such as the Øresund Bridge, or funded entirely by the State. The construction of the Great Belt Link in Denmark and the Øresund Bridge between Denmark and Sweden was funded by loans in the Danish and international capital markets and these loans are guaranteed by the Danish and Swedish governments. The entire construction costs (some $10bn), including interest, will eventually be paid by the users of the road and rail links including tolls from the motorists and fees from the railroad operators. The debt for the Øresund bridge is thus expected to be repaid in 2035 – 35 years after the opening of the bridge, although the debt for the landworks will be repaid within a time frame of almost 60 years. Other bridges and tunnels will also be funded by tolls. A variety of tolls will also help finance Boston's Big Dig and it has been intimated that it will take up to 50 years to pay back the project costs. For the Californian maglev system, it is projected that revenues from passenger fares, parking fees, freight and the like will be some $60bn over the next 40 or so years. And despite the huge costs of building the Channel Tunnel, revenue emanating from its use, although lower than projected and anticipated, is still greater than its operating costs.

#### Lack of property rights regime prevents private investment in space

Edward Aldridge Jr. et al, Under Secretary for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, at the Department of Defense, June 2004, “A Journey to Inspire, Innovate, and Discover,” Report of the President’s Commission on Implementation of United States Space Exploration Policy, http://www.nasa.gov/pdf/60736main\_M2M\_report\_small.pdf

Because of this treaty regime, the legal status of a hypothetical private company engaged in making

products from space resources is uncertain. Potentially, this uncertainty could strangle a nascent spacebased industry in its cradle; no company will invest millions of dollars in developing a product to which their legal claim is uncertain. The issue of private property rights in space is a complex one involving national and international legal issues. However, it is imperative that these issues be recognized and addressed at an early stage in the implementation of the vision, otherwise there will be little significant private sector activity associated with the development of space resources, one of our key goals.

#### Private firms will focus on terrestrial investments, not space

David M. Livingston, business consultant, financial advisor, and strategic planner, 8/10/2000, “From Earth to Mars: A Cooperative Plan,” http://www.spacefuture.com/archive/from\_earth\_to\_mars\_a\_cooperative\_plan.shtml

Investment capital appears to be plentiful at the beginning of the twenty-first century, but it is still a finite resource. Unless a company or individual decides to invest in the Mars mission regardless of all other factors, investment capital will most likely go to the venture with the most profit potential for the least amount of risk. Terrestrial investments will almost always have the advantage in attracting investment capital. In addition, terrestrial investments have the least amount of risk since the infrastructure already exists on Earth for business ventures and transportation, the political risks are usually known, the legal environment is more certain, and, in most cases, new technology and engineering requirements are unnecessary.

### AT: Private CP – Links To Politics

#### CP links to politics – private space projects are controversial.

John M. Logsdon, Space Policy Institute, Elliott School of International Affairs, George Washington University, February 2011, “A new US approach to human spaceflight?” Space Policy, p.15

The Obama proposal came under immediate attack from members of Congress whose districts would be affected by the new strategy, firms that were threatened by the cancellation of their Constellation contracts, and spaceflight veterans, including several Apollo astronauts. The criticisms focused on the viability of relying on the private sector for crew transport to the ISS and the lack of specific goals and schedules for deep space exploration missions. Senator Richard Shelby (R-AL) succeeded in getting a provision written into law that prohibited NASA from cancelling any Constellation contracts and from starting the new programs proposed by the president until the Congress completed action on the FY2011 budget proposal and had either approved, rejected or modified the new human spaceflight strategy.

#### Congress opposes private leadership on space exploration.

Esther Dyson, chairman of EDventure Holdings and an investor in a variety of start-ups, 2/8/2010, “Prepare for Liftoff,” Foreign Policy, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/02/08/prepare\_for\_liftoff

However, common sense doesn't always rule in politics. When the Internet opened up to commerce, there were objections from the high priests of the cyberspace, who didn't want anyone to turn their holy calling into a business. In the case of space, there are jobs at stake and, more importantly, politicians' careers at stake. Obama is proposing to cancel some $25 billion in NASA programs -- with most of the cuts affecting jobs in Alabama, Utah, and Texas, whose congressional delegations are now up in arms.

#### CP controversial – powerful politicians oppose moves to privatize space.

David Kushner, award-winning journalist, September 2010, “Launching Into the Era of Private Spaceflight,” Discover, http://discovermagazine.com/2010/sep/18-launching-into-age-of-private-spaceflight/article\_view?b\_start:int=0&-C=

But many politicians and pundits do not trust that private companies can get the job done safely and effectively. Their concerns range from the technological challenges to the economics of putting people into space: If NASA downsizes, where will the money come from to finance the development of a whole new industry? And if other customers do not materialize, can NASA alone keep that industry afloat? The attacks have been especially swift and sharp from senators Barbara Mikulski (D-MD) and Richard Shelby (R-AL), who represent states that currently get substantial NASA investment, as well as from former Apollo astronauts Neil Armstrong and Eugene Cernan. Armstrong called the cancellation of Constellation "devastating." More surprising, even major aerospace companies have expressed doubt. John Karas, vice president and general manager of human spaceflight at Lockheed Martin, recently declared, “I don’t think there is a business case for us.”

### AT: Critiques – Space Solves

#### Space colonization leads to a transformation of consciousness that solves war

Frank White, SETI researcher, 1990, The SETI Factor

Many scholars and scientists see benefits in opening up the “space frontier.” It provides an opportunity to divert nationalistic energies away from war and toward peaceful cooperation ventures; it also offers an expanded range in which to work out new forms of societal and political interaction. In the Overview Effect, I pointed out that space exploration also provides an opportunity for human awareness to evolve and transform itself because it provides us with a new perspective on the earth, the universe, and ourselves. The defining feature of the space development subculture is a refusal to consider the future of humanity as confined to the surface of one planet. While members of the space development community may be concerned about the future of Earth, it is not because they plan to stay here. They see themselves as the leaders in creating a “spacefaring civilization,” and making humanity into a “multi-planet species.”

#### Space exploration changes the whole framework of human understanding

Frank White, SETI researcher, M.Phil. from Oxford, 1987, “Creating the Future,” in The Overview Effect, p. 182-183

The people in the cave are like the imaginary detractors of the explorer fish, and they are frighteningly like us today. We fail to realize that we are in space, that we have the means to experience it on a vast scale, and that doing so will free us from the illusory reality in which we daily indulge. Instead, we spend our time trying to fit outer space into our current paradigm and criticizing our astronauts for failing to explain the light in terms that the darkness can understand. Unfortunately, this is the perfect prescription for our continued solitary confinement from the rest of the universe. Going into space is not the point. Realizing that we are in space and beginning to deal with the broader implications is the point. We are in space and we cannot be anywhere else, ever. The question is whether our expanded awareness will have a positive impact on social evolution. Seen from this point of view, the issue is whether we are ready to mature as a species, look beyond our narrow [end page 182] parochial concerns, and become true citizens of the universe. Realizing that we are in space is mind-expanding, but we hate to admit it because it brings us back up against the issues of awareness and choice today, not in the future. The new civilizations, like the Kingdom of God, are within us. Ultimately, going to space is not about a technological achievement, but about the human spirit and our contribution to universal purpose. Space, as used in the new space movement, is a metaphor for expansiveness, opportunity, and freedom. More than a place or even an experience, it is a state of mind. It is a physical, mental, and spiritual dimension in which humanity can move beyond the current equilibrium point, begin to change, and eventually transform itself into something so extraordinary that we cannot even imagine it.

#### Going to space enables a paradigm of planetary stewardship – solves their impact

Frank White, SETI researcher, M.Phil. from Oxford, 1987, “Creating the Future,” in The Overview Effect, p. 75

Many messages may be read into the view of the Earth from space. One is planetary management, the recognition that if the whole can be perceived, the whole can be the focus of practical as well as abstract interest. However, it should be clearly understood that planetary management does not mean planetary manipulation. Planetary management should be seen from a stewardship perspective and as participatory management at the highest level. The clear message of the Overview Effect is that the Earth is a whole system and humanity one of many interdependent species calling the planet home. A regard for all life as sacred becomes a practical as well as moral position when we see the critical role that all life plays in maintaining the system. If the next step in human social evolution is to build a planetary civilization, then what is most needed is the ability to see and deal with problems and opportunities on a planetary level. It is also the ability not only to observe, but truly communicate with, the planet as a whole. This message is implicit in the whole Earth symbol itself.

### AT: Topicality – Transportation/Infrastructure

#### Space elevator is infrastructure

International Space Elevator Consortium, 2-17-2011, “Why do I want a Space Elevator?” <http://www.isec.org/index.php/resources/space-elevator-basics/why-do-i-want-a-space-elevator>

What kind of specific benefits could we expect to see from a functioning Space Elevator? As with the intercontinental railway, it’s impossible to foretell all of the uses of such an infrastructure, but here are some possibilities.

#### Space elevator is transportation infrastructure

Bradley Edwards, Physics PhD., Dir. Of Research-Inst. For Scientific Research, 2006, Leaving the Planet by Space Elevator, p. 161-2

If you want to ship large quantities of anything into space, and you want to do so cheaply (relatively speaking to rockets) and reliably, you need to change the equation. Instead of using rockets, build a transportation infrastructure, a ‘railway line’ into space, Before the intercontinental railway was built, shipping humans and cargo between the east coast and west coast of America required a dangerous overland trip or else the use of ships to transport goods around the tip of South America. You could certainly do it, but it was expensive, often dangerous, and the amount of cargo was limited. The intercontinental railway changed all of that. Travel and Commerce between the eastern and western halves of America exploded now that there was a safe, reliable, and inexpensive way to ship large quantities of goods back and forth.

#### It’s topical – space elevator is used for transportation

Dr. David Raitt, senior officer @ European Space Agency, and Dr. Bradley Edwards, President X Tech Corp, 2004, “The Space Elevator: Economics and Applications,”

In a similar manner, revenues can be earned by the Space Elevator to pay off public or private loans, by the transportation of goods (e.g. space outpost structural elements, satellites, stores, passengers) to various departure points along the ribbon. Such revenues could be generated early on and the expense of building a Space Elevator could become akin to building a motorway or rail network. Taking into account the cost recovery durations of for example 35 years for the Øresund bridge and even 20-30 years for a typical house mortgage, then there is no reason why the costs of building the Space Elevator should be not be recovered over a similar period. But it could pay for itself in far less time. If the Space Elevator costs $6bn and is paid back over 30 years – that works out to something like half a million dollars per day having to be recovered. If launch (operating) costs are eventually reduced to the projected level of $10/kg and a charge was made of $110/kg then the operators would get this $0.5m with the first elevator just lifting 5000kg/day. At a charge level of $1000/kg the elevator could be run at rates of current launches and make $5m/day. With second-generation climbers capable of transporting 20.000kg, a $1000/kg charge would bring in $20m per day with just one climber. Contrast this to the space shuttle which henceforth is expected to do only four launches per year. Even conventional launchers such as Ariane, Delta, Atlas or Proton are carried out only a few times per year.

## Light Rail Aff

### 1AC Inherency

#### Contention One: Inherency

#### High-speed rail funding will be cut in 2013

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned, and Robert Lane. Policy Focus Report @ Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. 2011. “High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for US Policy Makers.” <http://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/1948_High-Speed-Rail>.

The initial investment of $10.1 billion in the U.S. High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail Program, after years of minimal federal investment, required that the federal government and participating states quickly scale up to the challenge of laying the groundwork for a foundational program and implementing it at the same time. Those states that had the staff capacity, expertise, and experience in rail planning, such as Illinois, North Carolina, and Washington, were successful in securing high-speed rail grants. However, carrying the momentum of this initial investment forward has proven to be a struggle in a difficult fiscal environment, and California is currently the only federally funded Core Express high-speed rail project moving forward. In 2011, Congress voted to strip funding from the program. The expiration of the legislation authorizing the high-speed rail program in 2013 may provide an opportunity to consider policy changes.

#### This is silly – the economic return on high speed rail far outweighs the costs.

Andy Kunz, President and CEO of the US High Speed Rail Association, “US High-Speed Rail: Time to Hop Aboard or Be Left Behind”, Yale E 360, 3-10-2011, http://e360.yale.edu/feature/us\_high-speed\_rail\_time\_to\_hop\_aboard\_or\_be\_left\_behind/2378/

Fortunately, the foresight of the Obama administration and various states will ensure that the foundation of a national high-speed rail network will be laid in the coming years, with $8 billion in federal stimulus funds going to construct the first links in a high-speed rail network that is envisioned to stretch 17,000 miles by 2030. Bullet trains would eventually whisk people between all major U.S. cities — Los Angeles to Seattle, Dallas to Albuquerque, and Boston to Washington, at 220 miles per hour. The cost of such a network would be significant — $600 billion — but a combination of public and private funds would build the system, which would eventually yield benefits that far exceed the original investment.

#### Partisanship is overstated – we are at a turning point in rail – acting now is key.

Arthur Frommer, Owner of Arthur Frommer Online, Political Commentator, “Whether or Not the United States is to Enjoy High-Speed Rail Will Be Decisively Debated Within The Coming Weeks”, Frommers, 2-14-2012, <http://www.frommers.com/community/blogs/blog.cfm/arthur-frommer-online/whether-not-united-states-enjoy-high-speed-rail-will-decisively-debated-within-coming-weeks>.

A great many publications have failed to draw attention to the fact that the President's budget for Fiscal Year 2013 contains the first appropriation of a five-year plan to allocate between $35 and $50 billion for the development of high-speed rail in the United States. At last, our nation would take decisive steps to fund a high-speed rail corridor between Los Angeles and San Francisco, another along the west coast of Florida, one in the state of Michigan, and in other important and heavily populated areas. That kind of economic stimulus would not only create hundreds of thousands of new jobs, but would set us on the path towards becoming a modern, efficient and prosperous nation in the field of transportation. It should be noted, in my view, that this is not a partisan issue. A great many Republicans, including the one Republican cabinet member in the Administration, Secretary of Transportation Ray La Hood, enthusiastically support this national initiative. This week, Ray La Hood is in California, urging that legislators of both parties there stay firm in their insistence on creation of a high-speed rail corridor along the coast of California. So we are at a turning point. Are we to remain a horse-and-buggy nation, mired for hours on end in traffic jams, condemned to waste valuable time at crowded airports with planes stacked up in the skies, or are we to become a modern, efficient, economically-prosperous nation of sensible transportation? This, to me, is not a partisan goal, but should be advanced by people of all political persuasions.

### 1AC Plan

#### Thus the plan: The United States federal government should substantially increase its transportation infrastructure investment for high speed railroad systems in the United States.

### 1AC Growth Adv

#### The US is behind in global economic competition – high speed rail investment maintains US economic prestige and massively expands GDP.

Department of Treasury; Council of Economic Advisers. October 11, 2010. “An Economic Analysis of Infrastructure Investment.” Report by the Department of Treasury. <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/economic-policy/Documents/infrastructure_investment_report.pdf>.

By most measures, the United States is investing less in infrastructure than other nations. While there are reasons for this disparity, international comparisons can offer a useful benchmark to assess our investment decisions. We spend approximately 2 percent of GDP on infrastructure, a 50 percent decline from 1960.36,37 China and Europe, by contrast, spend close to 9 percent and 5 percent of GDP on infrastructure, respectively.38 To be clear, simple cross country comparisons do not account for differences in the current public capital stock, differences in demographics and population densities, and different transportation preferences across nations. However, it is clear that persistent neglect of our infrastructure will impact America’s competitive position vis- a-vis the rest of the world. Indeed, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce noted this in their Policy Declaration on Transportation Infrastructure, stating, “Long term underinvestment in transportation infrastructure is having an increasingly negative effect on the ability of the United States and its industries to compete in the global economy.” Looking at the case of high speed rail specifically, other nations are laying the groundwork for large-scale passenger rail systems in the future, while the U.S. is lagging behind. For example, China plans to spend an estimated $300 billion to have a high speed rail system in the country by 2020. China has already completed the fastest high speed rail line in the world, connecting Wuhan and Guangzhou, two cities with populations over 8 million people. The line covers 600 miles in only 3 hours.39 Another high speed rail line, running between Shanghai and Beijing, is set for completion in 2011. European nations and Japan have long had high speed rail systems. The Recovery Act contained $8 billion for high speed rail projects, and several states, including California, have approved billions more from their own coffers. However, significant additional investment is required if we hope to develop high speed rail corridors in the United States. High speed rail has the potential to link the American people together in a way that would not be possible under the current infrastructure system. Reducing intercity travel times, with trains reaching top speeds of 220 mph, could transform how and where Americans live and work, revitalizing regions and supporting new jobs**.**

#### US economic prestige is key to checking rising powers – American leadership independently checks war.

Zalmay Khalilzad, Former ambassador to the United Nations, 2-8-2011, “The Economy and National Security,” National Review, http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/259024/economy-and-national-security-zalmay-khalilzad?page=2

American retrenchment could have devastating consequences. Without an American security blanket, regional powers could rearm in an attempt to balance against emerging threats. Under this scenario, there would be a heightened possibility of arms races, miscalculation, or other crises spiraling into all-out conflict. Alternatively, in seeking to accommodate the stronger powers, weaker powers may shift their geopolitical posture away from the United States. Either way, hostile states would be emboldened to make aggressive moves in their regions. Since the end of the Cold War, a stable economic and financial condition at home has enabled America to have an expansive role in the world. Today we can no longer take this for granted. Unless we get our economic house in order, there is a risk that domestic stagnation in combination with the rise of rival powers will undermine our ability to deal with growing international problems. Regional hegemons in Asia could seize the moment, leading the world toward a new, dangerous era of multi-polarity.

### 1AC Growth Adv

#### Economic stagnation precipitates of Pandora’s box of global threats – very high risks of escalation and no possibility of conflict drawdown.

Mathew Harris and Jennifer Burrows, PhD in European History @ Cambridge and member of the NIC’s Long Rang Analysis Unit, “Revisiting the Future: The Geopolitical Effects of the Financial Crisis”, 2009, http://www.ciaonet.org/journals/twq/v32i2/f\_0016178\_13952.pdf

Of course, the report encompasses more than economics and indeed believes the future is likely to be the result of a number of intersecting and interlocking forces. With so many possible permutations of outcomes, each with ample Revisiting the Future opportunity for unintended consequences, there is a growing sense of insecurity. Even so, history may be more instructive than ever. While we continue to believe that the Great Depression is not likely to be repeated, the lessons to be drawn from that period include the harmful effects on fledgling democracies and multiethnic societies (think Central Europe in 1920s and 1930s) and on the sustainability of multilateral institutions (think League of Nations in the same period). There is no reason to think that this would not be true in the twenty-first as much as in the twentieth century. For that reason, the ways in which the potential for greater conflict could grow would seem to be even more apt in a constantly volatile economic environment as they would be if change would be steadier. In surveying those risks, the report stressed the likelihood that terrorism and nonproliferation will remain priorities even as resource issues move up on the international agenda. Terrorism’s appeal will decline if economic growth continues in the Middle East and youth unemployment is reduced. For those terrorist groups that remain active in 2025, however, the diffusion of technologies and scientific knowledge will place some of the world’s most dangerous capabilities within their reach. Terrorist groups in 2025 will likely be a combination of descendants of long established groups\_inheriting organizational structures, command and control processes, and training procedures necessary to conduct sophisticated attacks and newly emergent collections of the angry and disenfranchised that become self-radicalized, particularly in the absence of economic outlets that would become narrower in an economic downturn. The most dangerous casualty of any economically-induced drawdown of U.S. military presence would almost certainly be the Middle East. Although Iran’s acquisition of nuclear weapons is not inevitable, worries about a nuclear-armed Iran could lead states i n the region to develop new security arrangements with external powers, acquire additional weapons, and consider pursuing their own nuclear ambitions. It is not clear that the type of stable deterrent relationship that existed between the great powers for most of the Cold War would emerge naturally in the Middle East with a nuclear Iran. Episodes of low intensity conflict and terrorism taking place under a nuclear umbrella could lead to an unintended escalation and broader conflict if clear red lines between those states involved are not well established. The close proximity of potential nuclear rivals combined with underdeveloped surveillance capabilities and mobile dual-capable Iranian missile systems also will produce inherent difficulties in achieving reliable indications and warning of an impending nuclear attack. The lack of strategic depth in neighboring states like Israel, short warning and missile flight times, and uncertainty of Iranian intentions may place more focus on preemption rather than defense, potentially leading to escalating crises. 36 Types of conflict that the world continues to experience, such as over resources, could reemerge, particularly if protectionism grows and there is a resort to neo-mercantilist practices. Perceptions of renewed energy scarcity will drive countries to take actions to assure their future access to energy supplies. In the worst case, this could result in interstate conflicts if government leaders deem assured access to energy resources, for example, to be essential for maintaining domestic stability and the survival of their regime. Even actions short of war, however, will have important geopolitical implications. Maritime security concerns are providing a rationale for naval buildups and modernization efforts, such as China’s and India’s development of blue water naval capabilities. If the fiscal stimulus focus for these countries indeed turns inward, one of the most obvious funding targets may be military. Buildup of regional naval capabilities could lead to increased tensions, rivalries, and counterbalancing moves, but it also will create opportunities for multinational cooperation in protecting critical sea lanes. With water also becoming scarcer in Asia and the Middle East, cooperation to manage changing water resources is likely to be increasingly difficult both within and between states in a more dog-eat-dog world.

### 1AC Environment Adv

#### Plan is essential to curbing carbon emissions from driving and checks dependence on foreign oil.

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned, and Robert Lane. Policy Focus Report @ Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. 2011. “High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for US Policy Makers.” <http://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/1948_High-Speed-Rail>.

Energy mix: High-speed rail is the only available mode of long-distance travel that currently is not dependent on motor fuels. High-speed rail is powered by electricity, which is not without environmental problems depending on its source (see table 2). If it is powered by electricity generated from fossil fuels, such as coal or natural gas that discharge harmful greenhouse gas emissions, then its environmental benefits are limited. However, electricity is generally considered an improvement over petroleumgenerated power and provides a crucial advantage as the United States aims to reduce its dependence on foreign oil. Amtrak’s Northeast Corridor and parts of the Keystone Corridor (connecting Harrisburg, Pennsylvania to Philadelphia) are electrified. Most other conventional passenger trains in America operate on freight rail lines and are powered by diesel fuel. Energy planning needs to be a part of the planning for high-speed rail to ensure the reduction of greenhouse gases and other harmful pollutants. Even with the current energy mix that includes fossil fuel sources, however, high-speed rail can yield significant environmental benefits. A recent study by the University of Pennsylvania (2011) found that a new high-speed line in the Northeast Corridor, powered by electricity from the current energy mix, would divert nearly 30 million riders from cars and planes, attract 6 million new riders, and still reduce car emissions of carbon monoxide by more than 3 million tons annually. The system would also result in a reduction of carbon dioxide emissions if the energy mix were shifted to low carbon emitting sources. Nuclear power is a significant source of electricity for passenger rail in countries such as Belgium, France, Germany, and Spain. France is by far the largest nuclear power user, with a share of more than 85 percent for railway operations. However, growing concerns about nuclear power following the 2011 Fukushima Daiichi plant accident in Japan raise doubts about its role in the development of a U.S. high-speed rail system in the near future. Spain’s rail network uses renewable energy sources for 18.4 percent of its electricity (IFEU 2008). Japan’s high-speed rail uses geothermal and hydro power to meet up to 56 percent of its energy needs (Tan 2011).

#### High speed rail immediately cuts away auto and air travel – decreases the causes of CO2 swelling.

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned, and Robert Lane. Policy Focus Report @ Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. 2011. “High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for US Policy Makers.” <http://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/1948_High-Speed-Rail>.

High-speed rail is first and foremost a transportation improvement that provides a framework for other secondary benefits. Shorter travel times: High-speed rail can create travel time savings for those who would have used a different mode of transportation between urban centers. It improves overall access to many destinations in the megaregion and brings those places closer together, a phenomenon referred to as the “shrinking continent” (Spiekermann and Wegener 1994). Mode shift: Where it is competitive with other intercity transportation modes, high-speed rail can capture a large share of passenger volume. International experience suggests that high-speed rail usually captures 80 percent of air or rail trips, if the travel time by high-speed train is less than two and a half hours (UIC 2010a). Mode shift to rail provides the greatest benefit in regions where road and air capacity is constrained.

### 1AC Environment Adv–

#### Warming is real, anthropogenic, and causes extinction.

Terry L. Deibel, Prof. of IR @ National War College, 2007, “Foreign Affairs Strategy: Logic for American Statecraft”, Conclusion: American Foreign Affairs Strategy Today Anthropogenic – Caused by C02.

Deibel ‘7 (Terry L. Deibel, professor of IR at National War College, Foreign Affairs Strategy, “Conclusion: Finally, there is one major existential threat to American security (as well as prosperity) of a nonviolent nature, which, though far in the future, demands urgent action. It is the threat of global warming to the stability of the climate upon which all earthly life depends. Scientists worldwide have been observing the gathering of this threat for three decades now, and what was once a mere possibility has passed through probability to near certainty. Indeed not one of more than 900 articles on climate change published in refereed scientific journals from 1993 to 2003 doubted that anthropogenic warming is occurring. “In legitimate scientific circles,” writes Elizabeth Kolbert, “it is virtually impossible to find evidence of disagreement over the fundamentals of global warming.” Evidence from a vast international scientific monitoring effort accumulates almost weekly, as this sample of newspaper reports shows: an international panel predicts “brutal droughts, floods and violent storms across the planet over the next century”; climate change could “literally alter ocean currents, wipe away huge portions of Alpine Snowcaps and aid the spread of cholera and malaria”; “glaciers in the Antarctic and in Greenland are melting much faster than expected, and…worldwide, plants are blooming several days earlier than a decade ago”; “rising sea temperatures have been accompanied by a significant global increase in the most destructive hurricanes”; “NASA scientists have concluded from direct temperature measurements that 2005 was the hottest year on record, with 1998 a close second”; “Earth’s warming climate is estimated to contribute to more than 150,000 deaths and 5 million illnesses each year” as disease spreads; “widespread bleaching from Texas to Trinidad…killed broad swaths of corals” due to a 2-degree rise in sea temperatures. “The world is slowly disintegrating,” concluded Inuit hunter Noah Metuq, who lives 30 miles from the Arctic Circle. “They call it climate change…but we just call it breaking up.” From the founding of the first cities some 6,000 years ago until the beginning of the industrial revolution, carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere remained relatively constant at about 280 parts per million (ppm). At present they are accelerating toward 400 ppm, and by 2050 they will reach 500 ppm, about double pre-industrial levels. Unfortunately, atmospheric CO2 lasts about a century, so there is no way immediately to reduce levels, only to slow their increase, we are thus in for significant global warming; the only debate is how much and how serous the effects will be. As the newspaper stories quoted above show, we are already experiencing the effects of 1-2 degree warming in more violent storms, spread of disease, mass die offs of plants and animals, species extinction, and threatened inundation of low-lying countries like the Pacific nation of Kiribati and the Netherlands at a warming of 5 degrees or less the Greenland and West Antarctic ice sheets could disintegrate, leading to a sea level of rise of 20 feet that would cover North Carolina’s outer banks, swamp the southern third of Florida, and inundate Manhattan up to the middle of Greenwich Village. Another catastrophic effect would be the collapse of the Atlantic thermohaline circulation that keeps the winter weather in Europe far warmer than its latitude would otherwise allow. Economist William Cline once estimated the damage to the United States alone from moderate levels of warming at 1-6 percent of GDP annually; severe warming could cost 13-26 percent of GDP. But the most frightening scenario is runaway greenhouse warming, based on positive feedback from the buildup of water vapor in the atmosphere that is both caused by and causes hotter surface temperatures. Past ice age transitions, associated with only 5-10 degree changes in average global temperatures, took place in just decades, even though no one was then pouring ever-increasing amounts of carbon into the atmosphere. Faced with this specter, the best one can conclude is that “humankind’s continuing enhancement of the natural greenhouse effect is akin to playing Russian roulette with the earth’s climate and humanity’s life support system. At worst, says physics professor Marty Hoffert of New York University, “we’re just going to burn everything up; we’re going to heat the atmosphere to the temperature it was in the Cretaceous when there were crocodiles at the poles, and then everything will collapse.” During the Cold War, astronomer Carl Sagan popularized a theory of nuclear winter to describe how a thermonuclear war between the Untied States and the Soviet Union would not only destroy both countries but possibly end life on this planet. Global warming is the post-Cold War era’s equivalent of nuclear winter at least as serious and considerably better supported scientifically. Over the long run it puts dangers form terrorism and traditional military challenges to shame. It is a threat not only to the security and prosperity to the United States, but potentially to the continued existence of life on this planet.

### 1AC Solvency

#### The plan expands high speed rail – it cradles the infant industry and prevents bankruptcy of startups.

House Science, Space, and Technology Subcommittee on Investigation and Oversight Hearing :"Impact of Tax Policies on the Commercial Application of Renewable Energy Technology."[9]. (2012, April). Congressional Documents and Publications. http://science.house.gov/sites/republicans.science.house.gov/files/documents/hearings/HHRG-112-SY21-WState-MThorning-20120419.pdf

Subsidies are government financial transfers to an industry, through payments to workers or to firms. Probably nobody would deny that the government is subsidizing the industry if it is paying part of the wages of workers in the industry or it is granting firms in the industry funds to make capital purchases. This is the narrowest definition of a subsidy. However there is little difference from the standpoint of the industry between a government transferring funds to it, on one hand, and waiving transfer payments, i.e. taxes, that the firm would normally make to the government. The tax code provisions and direct federal grants made available to clean energy industries meet the conventional definition of subsidies. The key question is: are the benefits of the taxpayer funded incentives worth the cost? Spending money on renewable energy projects creates an opportunity cost by diverting the funds from alternative uses; thus the issue is whether alternative uses of taxpayer dollars would yield a higher return is worth pursuing. Similarly, worth asking is whether society would be better off if the public (and private) funds spent on renewable energy were left in taxpayer's pockets. When economists justify subsidies, they usually do so in one of three ways. First, there is the "infant industry" argument. An industry, for instance, may be dominated by foreign (non-domestic) companies (e.g. textile manufacture by England during the early days of the United States) and for reasons of social policy, the government may want to develop an indigenous industry. Insufficient private capital may be available to permit the private sector, on its own, to accumulate sufficient capital to make the indigenous industry commercially competitive. The government then could subsidize the industry through grants, loans, equity infusions, tariff protection or tax incentives. When the industry has been built up to the point where it is self-sufficient, the subsidies would be removed. The second argument in favor of subsidization is that a large, critical industry may run into serious temporary difficulties and be in danger of ceasing operations. The government, in such a situation, would have at least three options: it can play no role and let the full market effects be felt; or it can directly subsidize the endangered firms with cash or equity infusions, loans or loan guarantees; or it can let the firms go bankrupt but intervene through the monetary system to prevent the bankruptcy of the firms from affecting other, healthy, part of the economy. A third argument in favor of subsidization is tied to current interests in environmental protection. Subsidies can be used to encourage firms and industries to behave in environmentally friendly ways.

#### And supply-side economics is on our side – high availability of labor makes infrastructure investment critical now.

Department of Treasury; Council of Economic Advisers. October 11, 2010. “An Economic Analysis of Infrastructure Investment.” Report by the Department of Treasury. <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/economic-policy/Documents/infrastructure_investment_report.pdf>.

The previous section analyzed the demand for public capital and demonstrated that additional, carefully selected infrastructure investment will yield substantial benefits to the U.S. economy in the future. This section looks at the supply side of infrastructure investment. The main conclusion is that now is a particularly opportune time to invest in infrastructure, because the availability of underutilized resources (especially labor) implies that the opportunity cost of infrastructure investment is currently well below its normal level.

### 1AC Solvency

#### Federal funding is the only viable strategy.

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned, and Robert Lane. Policy Focus Report @ Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. 2011. “High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for US Policy Makers.” <http://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/1948_High-Speed-Rail>.

Like other modes of transportation and public goods, high-speed rail generally does not pay for itself through ticket fares and other operating revenues. Reliable federal funding is needed for some portion of the upfront capital costs of constructing rail infrastructure, but operating revenues frequently cover operating and maintenance costs.

### Inherency – No HSR Now

#### Despite global trends, the United States has failed to develop a full high-speed rail system.

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned, and Robert Lane. Policy Focus Report @ Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. 2011. “High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for US Policy Makers.” <http://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/1948_High-Speed-Rail>.

Since the 1964 inauguration of Japan’s first Shinkansen bullet train connecting Tokyo to Osaka, commercial high-speed rail lines have been constructed in 14 countries. Together these lines provide billions of passenger trips, save many hours of travel time, and provide an exceptional level of safety. Now considered a well-established and proven technology, high-speed rail continues to offer benefits to the nations and regions it serves. This reliable, rapid, and safe ground transportation system offers increased regional mobility and accessibility, reduces fuel use, saves energy, regenerates cities and regions, and increases economic productivity. With the exception of the higher-speed Acela Express service operated by Amtrak on the Northeast Corridor, the United States has failed to develop high-speed rail and fully realize its benefits, despite numerous planning studies and aborted attempts to expand rail service in various regions since the 1960s. As a result, most Americans are unfamiliar with high-speed rail and its potential impacts on our cities, regions, and national landscape.

#### Significant government investment is a precondition for rail – this is not existent in the US, but is expanding in virtually every other country.

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned, and Robert Lane. Policy Focus Report @ Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. 2011. “High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for US Policy Makers.” <http://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/1948_High-Speed-Rail>.

Significant investments in the U.S. Interstate Highway System since the 1950s initially produced excess surface transportation capacity, but congestion is now common on many highway sections, particularly in and around major metropolitan areas. The federal government has also subsidized the aviation industry, but has lacked a comparable federal commitment to funding passenger rail infrastructure (figure 1). Such funding has been a precondition for bringing large rail capital projects to fruition in every other country where they exist. At least 19 countries around the world are building or planning new high-speed rail line**s** (UIC 2011). China has invested several hundred billion dollars in building the world’s most extensive high-speed rail system by 2012 (Bradsher 2010). Several oil- and gas-producing states in the Middle East are planning to spend billions of dollars on high-speed rail systems linking that region (Independent Online 2011**).** In Saudi Arabia, construction has already begun on a 276-mile high-speed rail line connecting the Islamic holy cities of Medina and Mecca via Jeddah, and the French engineering group Alstom has announced preliminary plans to build a high-speed rail line connecting Baghdad and Basra in Iraq (Telegraph 2011). Within the European Union system Spain is constructing some 1,500 miles of high-speed rail lines, France is planning more than 2,500 miles of new high-speed rail lines, and England has proposed the second phase of its national high-speed rail network.

### Inherency – No HSR Now

#### High speed rail is limited to the Northeast Corridor – most passenger rail systems remain conventional.

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned, and Robert Lane. Policy Focus Report @ Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. 2011. “High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for US Policy Makers.” <http://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/1948_High-Speed-Rail>.

High-speed rail in the United States is a story that, until recently, has been limited to the Northeast Corridor, where Amtrak began operating the Acela Express service in 2000. Its trains reach top speeds of 150 mph and average around 75 mph. Federal investments being made in the south end of the corridor, where trains average 86 mph, will soon bring top speeds to 160 mph. The Northeast Corridor is the country’s largest segment of publicly owned passenger rail infrastructure, which has contributed to its relative success. Most other passenger rail services nationwide operate on tracks owned by private freight railroads. The challenges of balancing freight and passenger operations in a single corridor restrict the ability to develop passenger rail speed, frequency, and reliability. Despite a history of disinvestment in rail passenger service by previous administrations and Congresses, the Obama administration is now moving ahead to build and improve conventional passenger rail service and develop selected high-speed rail corridors simultaneously. Most other countries historically have built and improved their conventional rail networks over decades and then made the leap to dedicated, high-speed corridors as the conventional lines reached capacity and required upgrades. In contrast, the case of California represents a leap from minimal existing passenger rail service today to a statewide high-speed rail system, similar to new corridor investments in Spain and China.

### Inherency – AT: Squo Funding Solves

#### Despite current transportation funding, US is still experiencing economic stagflation.

House Science, Space, and Technology Subcommittee on Investigation and Oversight Hearing :"Impact of Tax Policies on the Commercial Application of Renewable Energy Technology."[9]. (2012, April). Congressional Documents and Publications. http://science.house.gov/sites/republicans.science.house.gov/files/documents/hearings/HHRG-112-SY21-WState-MThorning-20120419.pdf

The U.S. federal government has provided funding, tax incentives and subsidies for the development and commercialization of renewable energy for many decades. In 2009, as White House Advisor Joseph Aldy noted, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act's $90 billion in support "represented an unprecedented investment in clean energy". n1 Key areas include support for renewable power generation, transportation including high-speed rail and mass transit, advanced vehicles and battery technology, grid modernization, carbon capture and storage and clean energy manufacturing. The Recovery Act extended the Production Tax Credit (which has been in existence since 1992) for wind, geothermal and other renewable energy for an additional 3 years and created two new programs to promote renewable power investment: the 1603 grant program and the 1705 loan guarantee program. The 1603 program is a subsidy for investment in new renewable generation capacity, a developer can choose between a PTC, a 30 % investment tax credit (ITC) or a 1603 cash grant equal to 30% of the investment's cost (solar developers can only choose between the ITC and a cash grant). As noted in Joseph Aldy's 2012 report, the Recovery Act's 1705 loan guarantee program represented a modification of the existing section 1703 energy loan guarantee program created in 2005. "The new program supported conventional renewable power, transmission, and biofuel projects, as well as innovative technologies eligible for loan guarantees under the 1703 program. The Recovery Act appropriated $6 billion to the 1705 program so that the Federal government would pay for the credit subsidy associated with loan guarantees. By providing loan guarantees, this program could make debt capital available and lower the costs of debt for commercial renewable project developers." n2 The U.S. economic recovery remains weak, unemployment remains stubbornly high, investment remains below the pre-recession level and the federal budget deficit is projected to be 7.2% of GDP in 2012. These economic factors suggest that a careful examination of whether the incentives in the tax code, direct federal expenditures and subsidies(including those added in the Recovery Act) for renewable energy are the best and highest use of U.S. taxpayer's dollars is warranted.

#### HSIPR funding is limited – only two rail systems have qualified for federal grants.

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned, and Robert Lane. Policy Focus Report @ Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. 2011. “High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for US Policy Makers.” <http://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/1948_High-Speed-Rail>.

In 2009, the Obama administration launched the High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail (HSIPR) Program, a competitive grant program that makes awards around the country for projects that seek to develop dedicated high-speed rail corridors and increase speeds, frequency, and reliability on existing rail lines. In awarding the projects, the FRA developed a new definition that distinguishes three tiers of high-speed and intercity passenger rail service, which differ somewhat from international definitions of highspeed rail (figure 2). The top tier U.S. service, termed Core Express, operates at speeds above 125 and up to 250 mph on dedicated tracks. According to the U.S. Department of Transportation, the “FRA’s vision for a national high-speed rail program is to develop tiered passenger rail corridors that take into account the different markets and geographic contexts found throughout the United States” (U.S. DOT 2010, 10). This is consistent with the recommendation in this report that investments in Core Express corridors be directed toward the largest markets in the country, where population density and congestion on competing modes of transportation justify the level of investment investment in dedicated high-speed rail. Lesser investments in Regional or Emerging/ Feeder corridors could serve smaller networks of metropolitan regions and emerging markets, using an incremental approach to making improvements over time. Under these definitions, the planned California high-speed rail system is the only project awarded a federal grant to date that is designed to be a Core Express service with top speeds of 220 mph on new, dedicated tracks. The existing Acela Express service in the Northeast Corridor currently meets the FRA’s definition of Regional service, though plans for the Northeast Corridor would bring the service up to Core Express (see chapter 5). Most other passenger rail services operating on freight rights-of-way in the United States fall into the category of Emerging/Feeder service.

### Inherency – AT: Squo Funding

No future funding – Republicans drawing a line to reform high-speed rail.

Carolyn Lockhead, Staff Writer, “House GOP kills high speed rail funding”, San Francisco Gate, 11-17-2011, http://blog.sfgate.com/nov05election/2011/11/17/house-gop-kills-high-speed-rail-funding/

No surprise: the House has just passed a spending bill that kills high speed rail funding for fiscal year 2012. The Senate is expected to follow suit. That means California should not expect the billions of dollars in federal aid on which its futuristic plan for bullet trains depends. “By zeroing out high-speed intercity passenger rail funding, we are being given the unique opportunity to refocus and reform the high-speed rail program on the rail lines that will produce the most benefit for the least amount of cost,” said Rep. Bill Schuster, R-Pa.

### Solvency – Yes Ridership

#### Plan resolves the lack of alternatives to driving – this is key to assisting middle class families.

Department of Treasury; Council of Economic Advisers. October 11, 2010. “An Economic Analysis of Infrastructure Investment.” Report by the Department of Treasury. <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/economic-policy/Documents/infrastructure_investment_report.pdf>.

The President’s proposal emphasizes transportation choices, including mass transit and high speed rail, to deliver the greatest long-term benefits to those who need it most: middle class families. The average American family spends more than $8,600 a year on transportation, one-third more than they spend on food. For the 90 percent of Americans who are not among the top decile in income, transportation costs absorb one out of every six dollars of income. This burden is due in large part to the lack of alternatives to expensive and often congested automobile travel. Multi-modal transportation investments are critical to get American families moving again without wasting their time and their money sitting in traffic.

Federal decision makers would prioritize ideal ridership regions – flips optimism bias because it ensures we develop the system where it would be successful.

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned, and Robert Lane. Policy Focus Report @ Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. 2011. “High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for US Policy Makers.” <http://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/1948_High-Speed-Rail>.

Federal decision makers should prioritize high-speed rail investments in corridors that exhibit regional characteristics that contribute to ridership demand, including population density, employment concentrations, transit connections, existing airline markets, and congestion on parallel road corridors. Federal planners should analyze both the benefits expected to be generated in specific corridors and the cost estimates for construction and ongoing operations. The respective roles of high-speed Core Express corridors and conventional Regional and Emerging/ Feeder routes need to be clarified, with well-defined objectives for each type of rail service.

#### Northeast and California stations would be successes – cooperation with private entities ensure a smooth establishment of a national system.

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned, and Robert Lane. Policy Focus Report @ Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. 2011. “High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for US Policy Makers.” <http://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/1948_High-Speed-Rail>.

The Northeast Corridor and California offer the best opportunities for initial highspeed rail service, but management and financing challenges remain. In the Northeast, it may be desirable to separate the corridor’s operations and infrastructure functions in order to attract private capital and create a single-purpose entity capable of carrying out an ambitious high-speed rail plan. A Northeast Corridor infrastructure corporation would design, build, and maintain tracks, stations, dispatching, and other systems, while one or more train operators would pay track access fees to operate intercity high-speed trains once the new line is built. The infrastructure corporation could enter into long-term lease arrangements for portions of the right-of-way, and publicprivate partnership agreements could be developed for major pieces of infrastructure, such as tunnels and bridges. Finally, the infrastructure corporation could contract with Amtrak and private operators to provide competing high-speed intercity and high-speed commuter services in the corridor, offering travelers a range of price-points and services.

### Solvency – Congress Necessary

#### Past high speed rail investments prove the executive can’t act alone – Congress controls the purse – no other way to build infrastructure.

US News, “Should the Government Fund High-Speed Rail?”, US News Staff, News Opinion Column, 2-9-2011, http://www.usnews.com/opinion/articles/2011/02/09/should-the-government-fund-high-speed-rail

Yesterday, Vice President Joe Biden announced the White House plan to invest $53 billion over the next six years into a high-speed passenger rail network, including $8 billion in the coming fiscal year. The proposed plan would be a step toward providing high-speed rail access to 80 percent of Americans within 25 years, a goal President Obama laid out in his State of the Union address last month. The funds—part of the president’s budget he will send to Congress next week—would develop new and improve existing rail corridors. “There are key places where we cannot afford to sacrifice as a nation—one of which is infrastructure,” Biden told a crowd at Philadelphia’s busy 30th Street train station, arguing the investment is part of winning the future. “If we sit back, a lot of other folks are going to eat our lunch,” he said. [Read Little Rock, Ark., Mayor Hays's Editorial: High Speed Rail is Key to Economic Development.]

#### Funding is a prereq – must be seized first.

Representative Albio Sires (D-NJ), “Making High-Speed Rail a National Priority”, The Hill’s Congress Blog, 3-14-2011, http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/economy-a-budget/149263-making-high-speed-rail-a-national-priority

With dedicated funding, true high speed rail can become a reality and economic and environmental benefits can be realized. Constructing high speed rail will create new jobs and sustain long-term employment. New rail stations will spur economic development in the surrounding areas and promote livable communities. High speed rail also presents an opportunity to decrease our dependence on foreign oil. High speed rail is an energy efficient mode of transportation that will protect our environment and improve our nation’s health. Through rail, our nation’s carbon footprint will be reduced and this mode of transportation will act as an alternative to congested highways and aviation systems. Maintaining, and not only building high speed rail, is essential to its success. Finding a source of stable funding is necessary, and at this early stage, we should be open to all ideas. The Obama Administration has already begun efforts to build high speed rail and the most recent proposal to spend $53 billion over the next six years sends a strong, necessary message. The President has challenged us with a goal of giving 80% of Americans access to high-speed rail within 25 years. We should see this challenge as an opportunity to put Americans to work for decades to come.

#### Congressional denial of funds impedes development – it must provide the funding – the signal is key.

Michael Doyle, Staff Writer @ McClatchy Newspapers, “Congress poised to reject high-speed rail funding”, 4-20-2012, McClatchy DC, http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2012/04/20/146185/congress-poised-to-reject-high.html

WASHINGTON — The Obama administration sought $1 billion for high-speed rail next year; Congress is on track to provide zip. In a bad sign -- but not a killing blow -- for California’s speedy rail ambitions, senators this week joined their U.S. House counterparts in dismissing the administration’s funding request. The bicameral blow-off means a fiscal 2013 transportation spending bill will omit the high-speed rail dollars President Barack Obama wanted. On its face, the omission of new high-speed support does not directly impede California’s program. The state already has received some $3.3 billion in federal funds to get the project started, and no additional funds were planned on for the new fiscal year that starts Oct. 1. “This is something we anticipated,” Dan Richard, chair of the California High-Speed Rail Authority, said in an interview Friday. “In our business plan, we do not expect any additional federal funds for at least three years.” Long-term, though, the omission underscores the complications California could face in coming years when federal funds are explicitly relied upon. The state’s latest high-speed rail business plan anticipates the federal government providing $42 billion of the total project cost, now pegged at $68.4 billion.

### Growth Adv – Competitiveness Down Now

#### US economic competitiveness is waning – the lack of a high speed rail system is the primary cause.

Gene Richards, Visiting Editor with The Modesto Bee and a commercial aviator for 38 years, “High-speed rail is long overdue in the United States”, 3-28-2012, The Modesto Bee, http://www.modbee.com/2012/03/28/2133835/high-speed-rail-is-long-overdue.html

On March 20, The Modesto Bee published an editorial piece recommending an end to the high-speed rail project. The Bee's idea is that "this is not the right time to proceed with this wildly expensive project." They are half right. This "wildly expensive project" should have been completed years ago! The United States has slowly lost the competitive edge it enjoyed at the end of World War II. Europe and Asia struggled mightily during the post-war years just to eat. We helped to put them back on their feet, and they used that help wisely to become self-sufficient. Self-sufficiency was not an end, but just a beginning for them. Japan and Korea took over world shipbuilding; Japan and Germany gained in auto production; and European consortiums became equal in aircraft products. Electronics, refrigerators and tires are built elsewhere — but very few of them in the United States. Japan, China, Russia, Spain, France, Belgium and Italy all have built successful high-speed rail. High-speed rail is not a maybe — it is here now, and it is here to stay. As my grandmother put it, "The longer we wait, the behinder we get."

#### US competitiveness is in decline.

Niall Ferguson, Prof. of History @ Harvard, “Is the U.S. Losing Competitiveness?”, House Appropriations Publication, 3-28-2012, http://appropriations.house.gov/UploadedFiles/03.28.12\_CJS\_-\_American\_Manufacturing\_and\_Job\_Repatriation\_-\_Niall\_Ferguson\_-\_Testimony.pdf

In just four year’s time, according to the International Monetary Fund, the U.S. economy is likely to be overtaken by China’s, if gross domestic product (GDP) is calculated on the basis of purchasing power parity. For first time since the 1880s, the United States will no longer have the world’s largest economy. Nor is that the only sign that the U.S. economy is suffering relative decline. The U.S. stock market was heavily outperformed by most emerging markets over the past ten years. The average annual return for American stocks was 0.5% between 2001 and 2011, compared with 11.4% for emerging market stocks. For ordinary Americans, as well as for international investors, the past decade has been deeply disappointing. Between 1999 and 2007 – the year when the financial crisis began – median household income fell in real terms. It has fallen further since then. According to the National Bureau of Economic Research, the recession caused by the financial crisis ended two years ago, but the economy still needs to create an additional 7 million jobs to get back to pre-recession levels, plus another 5 million to match the continued growth in the labor force. This, despite massive levels of monetary and fiscal stimulus that have, respectively, trebled the size of the Fed’s balance sheet and nearly doubled the ration of federal debt to GDP.

### Growth Adv – Competitiveness Down

#### US competitiveness down—Harvard survey proves

Edward Alden, Researcher and Writer at the CFR, “Competitiveness: How the United States Lost its Way”, 2-17-2012, CFR, http://blogs.cfr.org/renewing-america/2012/02/17/competitiveness-how-the-united-states-lost-its-way/

Porter and his colleague Jan Rivkin penned the key article in the issue, entitled “Choosing the United States.” Based on surveys of some 10,000 Harvard Business School alumni, it concludes that the United States is attracting a far smaller share than it should of high-value-adding activities. The reasons are varied, including corporate misperceptions of the gains that come from outsourcing, but two stand out: U.S. policymakers “are not addressing weakness in the national business environment and are doing little to fight economic distortions that disfavor location in the United States.” And for those skeptical of the importance of manufacturing, like my CFR colleague Jagdish Bhagwati, I would recommend the article by Gary Pisano and Willy Shih that builds on their work showing that economies that do not make things also tend to lose the ability to innovate in manufacturing. While they are quite rightly opposed to targeted industrial policies, they recommend a big increase in government support for R & D in the manufacturing sciences, as well as tax, regulatory, and training policies that encourage investment in manufacturing. Porter and Rivkin raise another important point. While the United States must do far more to attract and retain investment, our standard of living will fall if the primary means for doing so are wage cuts, a weaker dollar, or boosting productivity by firing workers and demanding more of those who remain. This is the “race to the bottom” that globalization skeptics have long feared, and there is some evidence that the otherwise encouraging recent uptick in manufacturing employment is in part the result of falling U.S. wages, coupled with rising wages in China and other offshore locations. Instead, the goal must be to make the United States a compelling investment location despite its relatively high costs compared with emerging markets. Much of the rest of the issue is concerned with how best to do this, in areas such as education and skills training, finance, fiscal policy, entrepreneurship, and the green economy. There is too much here to summarize easily, and some of the ideas are better than others. Read it for yourself. Restoring American competitiveness, as Harvard Business School dean Nitin Nohria writes in the introduction, matters to all of us.

### Growth Adv – Econ Down Now

#### US economic growth is fragile – high oil prices are hampering recovery.

Margaret McQuaile, Staff Writer, “Oil Prices Still Very High in Fragile Global Economy”, 5-29-2012, Platts (London), http://www.platts.com/RSSFeedDetailedNews/RSSFeed/Oil/8336418

Oil prices are still unacceptably high at a time when the global economic recovery remains fragile, International Energy Agency chief economist Fatih Birol said in an interview ahead of a key gas report Tuesday, calling on key oil producing countries such as Saudi Arabia to continue to "behave responsibly" during the months ahead. Birol declined to talk specifically about the upcoming meeting of oil producer group OPEC on June 14, but said key producers shared the agency's concern about oil price levels, currently around $107/barrel for Brent crude futures and $91/barrel for US light crude. Nor would he say whether the IEA was likely to release oil from emergency stockpiles or whether any release might be ordered along the lines of a year ago, when the agency ordered the release of 60 million barrels of oil over two months to compensate for the loss of Libyan exports as a result of the uprising that began in mid-February. "The oil prices are still very high for the global economy and they are especially high when the recovery is in such a fragile situation," Birol said Monday in an embargoed telephone interview from the IEA's Paris headquarters. "We know the situation in Europe, in the US -- recently we got some not very encouraging data [on] the US economy. And even China's economy seems to be slowing down," he said. "So, as a result of that, I think the prices are still very high for the global economic recovery."

#### US and global economy are at risk of collapse—this recession will be worse

Benjamin Diokno, Prof. of Econ @ School of Economics – U of Philippines, “So far, so nothing”, Bworld Online, 5-29-2012, http://www.bworldonline.com/content.php?section=Opinion&title=So-far,-so-nothing&id=52568]

The global economy is on the brink of a double-dip recession. The euro zone is in a bloody mess. Greece may or may not exit the European Union. Spain, Portugal and Italy are facing hard times. The US economy continues to be weak, even as its politicians are distracted by the November presidential elections. China’s economy is slowing. And while Japan’s economy has shown some life, the sustainability of its recovery hinges on a strong global growth. Is the Philippines ready for another global recession? Bangko Sentral ng Pilipinas (BSP) Governor Tetangco has some brave words: "Philippine banks have continued to reduce their exposure to the troubled euro zone and thus the possibility of a further worsening will have a limited impact." Reassuring? No. The real impact of another global recession on the Philippines is not on Philippines banks, but on the real economy. Its impact will be loss of jobs, economic slowdown, and the worsening of the economic wellbeing of Filipinos. The impact of another recession could be much worse than the 2008-2009 recession. It is likely to be more difficult to recover from an economic relapse. Initial conditions have changed. More people are jobless, poorer, and generally more tired of severe adjustment measures. Governments are now more heavily indebted and their appetite for fiscal stimulus are diminished. The impact of an accommodative monetary policy is likely to be feeble with interest rates nearing zero levels.

### Growth Adv – Econ Down Now

#### US is at risk of a double-dip – fossil fuel dependence is a culprit.

Russ Britt, Staff Writer @ Marketwatch, “Expect stagnant U.S. economy in 2013: Roubini”, 5-2-2012 Marketwatch, http://articles.marketwatch.com/2012-05-02/general/31533224\_1\_double-dip-recession-nouriel-roubini-greek-debt-debacle]

LOS ANGELES (MarketWatch) — The U.S. economy could retreat into stagnation in 2013 and ultimately cast the nation into the second half of a double-dip recession, high-profile economist Nouriel Roubini said Wednesday. Speaking at the Milken Institute’s Global Conference in Beverly Hills, Calif., Roubini noted that real wages for U.S. workers are not growing and that America’s crushing debt is strangling growth. That translates into possible fiscal decay in which GDP will be “lucky” to grow 2% this year and faces the prospect of retreating into near-zero growth next year, according to Roubini. Both political parties can share blame for the trouble, he added, arguing that the Republican Party wants to limit spending and Democrats don’t want to cut programs, and so are at an impasse. Little is likely to change regardless of this year’s presidential election, as Senate Democrats are likely to use the filibuster even if Republican candidate Mitt Romney unseats President Barack Obama. “If there is gridlock, it’s going to get worse,” Roubini said. Change will have to come in several forms, including higher taxes for all — not just the rich — and the nation’s entitlement programs will need to be reformed, he commented. Roubini, noted for his dire predictions, won extensive praise after correctly predicting the housing-market crash and recession of 2008-09. Host Michael Milken, and Roubini himself, made light of the economist’s well-known pessimism at the conference. His caustic humor came to light when discussing the ongoing economic crisis in Europe, as well as the Greek debt debacle. “They’ve had a big fat Greek wedding for the last 20 or 30 years,” Roubini said of the troubled nation. On a more serious note, he pointed out several scenarios that could wreak further global economic havoc, including further conflicts between the United States and Iran, or Israel and Iran. But it may not be limited to just that, as a whole host of issues could make life difficult in the region. “The entire Middle East is really a mess,” Roubini said. “This Arab spring is going to become an Arab winter.” Milken said that vast U.S. shale deposits could lessen the nation’s reliance on Mideast oil within several years, but Roubini was skeptical it could be done anytime soon. Getting motorists to convert to natural gas-burning cars will take years, meaning that becoming energy independent could take up to three decades with no viable national energy policy. “Where is the leadership?” Roubini asked.

### Growth Adv – US Losing Rail Race Now

#### **US losing rail race now – China, India, other developing countries are beating us in lieu of lack of US development.**

Andy Kunz, President and CEO of the US High Speed Rail Association, “US High-Speed Rail: Time to Hop Aboard or Be Left Behind”, Yale E 360, 3-10-2011, http://e360.yale.edu/feature/us\_high-speed\_rail\_time\_to\_hop\_aboard\_or\_be\_left\_behind/2378/

China has committed to investing $360 billion to vastly expand its showcase network of high-speed trains, which already carry passengers at more than 200 miles per hour between some of the country’s largest cities. Spain, despite its economic woes, is investing $170 billion to extend its acclaimed high-speed rail system, which now makes the 386-mile Madrid-Barcelona run in just 2 hours, 38 minutes — compared to six hours by car. A similar boom in high-speed rail construction is taking place throughout Europe, from the boot of Italy to the Baltic Sea. Worldwide, nations not normally associated with the bullet train revolution — India, Brazil, Argentina, and Morocco, among others — are making plans to build high-speed rail networks. They understand that rapid, inter-city rail systems will be essential to developing competitive 21st-century economies as oil supplies dwindle, highways and airports face increasing congestion, and pressure to reduce carbon emissions rises. And the United States? For the past several months the news on the high-speed rail front has been dominated by several governors, swept into power by the Tea Party movement, proudly proclaiming that they will have nothing to do with high-speed rail projects, which they contend are boondoggles. Indeed, the governors of Florida, Wisconsin, and Ohio have collectively rejected $3.6 billion in federal funds that would have covered nearly all of the cost of building rail lines on such routes as Orlando to Tampa, Milwaukee to Madison, and Cleveland to Columbus.

#### Rail is the only option – the window for revitalizing competitiveness is a decade.

Andy Kunz, President and CEO of the US High Speed Rail Association, “US High-Speed Rail: Time to Hop Aboard or Be Left Behind”, Yale E 360, 3-10-2011, http://e360.yale.edu/feature/us\_high-speed\_rail\_time\_to\_hop\_aboard\_or\_be\_left\_behind/2378/

The U.S. must build a national high-speed rail network if it hopes to maintain its competitiveness in the world economy. China and Europe are now moving ahead with their high-speed rail networks at breakneck speed, which means that in a decade or two they will have significantly reduced their dependence on imported oil, created tens of millions of new jobs, and saved their countries trillions of dollars by vastly improving the productivity of their economies thanks to a low-carbon transportation sector that moves people and goods at speeds that could one day hit 300 miles per hour, or more. The U.S. can be part of that future. But if more states follow the example of Florida, Wisconsin, and Ohio, the country will remain shackled by 19th- and 20th-century forms of transportation in a 21st-century world. Contemplate this image: China, Europe, Russia, South America, and other parts of the globe are streaking by at 250 miles per hour while the likes of Governor Scott are stuck in a traffic jam on an interstate, watching the trains whiz past.

### Growth Adv – US Losing Rail Race Now

#### The US is lagging behind our closest competitors in Asia and Europe.

Representative Albio Sires (D-NJ), “Making High-Speed Rail a National Priority”, The Hill’s Congress Blog, 3-14-2011, http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/economy-a-budget/149263-making-high-speed-rail-a-national-priority

“High speed rail.” The image I associate with those words is a comfortable and smooth ride. The view out the window is a pleasant blur and passengers vary from families to business travelers. The journey concludes sooner than expected, but the destination happens to be somewhere in Europe or Asia. It should be a journey that takes place here in the United States. Throughout the world, countries have poured substantial resources into high speed rail. Japan opened its first high speed rail line in 1964, and now captures 85% of the air/rail market between Tokyo and Osaka. France opened their first high speed rail line in 1981, and by 2009 had 1,160 miles of high speed rail line. More recently, in 1992, Spain opened its first high speed rail line and by 2003, Spain’s government spending on rail infrastructure surpassed their spending on roads.

### Growth Adv – Plan Boosts Economy

#### Every economic indicator improved by high speed rail development – no possibility of a link turn.

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned, and Robert Lane. Policy Focus Report @ Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. 2011. “High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for US Policy Makers.” <http://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/1948_High-Speed-Rail>.

High-speed rail’s ability to promote economic growth is grounded in its capacity to increase access to markets and exert positive effects on the spatial distribution of economic activity (Redding and Sturm 2008). Transportation networks increase market access, and economic development is more likely to occur in places with more and better transportation infrastructure. In theory, by improving access to urban markets, highspeed rail increases employment, wages, and productivity; encourages agglomeration; and boosts regional and local economies. Empirical evidence of high-speed rail’s impact around the world tends to support the following theoretical arguments for high-speed rail’s economic benefits.

#### The plan boosts residential and non-residential property values – boosts capital stock.

Department of Treasury; Council of Economic Advisers. October 11, 2010. “An Economic Analysis of Infrastructure Investment.” Report by the Department of Treasury. <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/economic-policy/Documents/infrastructure_investment_report.pdf>.

There are other positive benefits from infrastructure investments. According to the Bureau of Economic Analysis, publicly-owned transportation infrastructure makes up nearly 13 percent of our total non-residential capital stock, and this stock has resulted in significant positive externalities.16 Available evidence suggests that infrastructure investment can raise property values, which reflects an improvement in living standards. For example, research suggests that proximity to public transit raises the value of residential and commercial real estate. Bernard Weinstein studied the effect of the Dallas light rail system on property values, and found a jump in total valuations around DART stations that was about 25 percent greater than in similar neighborhoods not served by the system.17 This is consistent with studies conducted in St. Louis18, Chicago19, Sacramento20 and San Diego21, all of which find that property values experience a premium effect when located near public transit systems.

#### The plan directly benefits consumers – saves middle class Americans $6,250 a year – spurs business sales.

Department of Treasury; Council of Economic Advisers. October 11, 2010. “An Economic Analysis of Infrastructure Investment.” Report by the Department of Treasury. <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/economic-policy/Documents/infrastructure_investment_report.pdf>.

Improving our nation’s transportation system can save middle class families money by reducing the costs associated with congestion and the additional automobile maintenance caused by poor road conditions. One recent study found that poor conditions of roads cost the average motorist who drives in cities on a regular basis over $400 a year.30,31 Moreover, providing high speed rail and improved public transportation will provide middle class families with more options to save time and money, so that they can keep more of their income for other purposes and spend more time doing what they want, rather than spending time getting there. One study concluded that a two adult household using public transportation saved $6,250 a year compared to a similar family that is unable to use public transportation.32

### Growth Adv – Internal Link Magnifier

#### Productivity of the US economy is the central question – plan is sufficient to spur investment indirectly, even if direct economic benefits are minimal.

Adam Hersh, Economist @ the Center for American Progress, “Making Investments Today for a Competitive Economy Tomorrow”, 5-18-2012, Quarterly U.S. Productivity and Innovation Snapshot, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/05/may\_productivity\_snapshot.html

Productivity growth—the rate at which we increase production for a given amount of work and resources—is at the heart of economic growth, competitiveness, and sustained improvements in living standards for working Americans. Policy efforts were made to end the Great Recession of 2007–2009 and restore many dimensions of U.S. economic vitality, but a number of long-term trends still raise concerns about future economic competitiveness. And with slowing global economic growth, high oil prices, and resistance from conservatives in Congress and state governments to invest in America’s education, science, and infrastructure, risks for U.S. competitiveness may be rising. A number of factors affect future U.S. productivity growth, including the pace of business investment, the availability of skilled workers, investments in science and research, and adequate financing for businesses to bring innovative new ideas and products to market. The indicators reviewed in this brief raise serious concerns for future U.S. productivity and, in turn, U.S. economic competitiveness: Productivity growth slipped in early 2012 but has accelerated by nearly 7 percent since the start of the recession. Business investment remains historically low. Though profits are ample, businesses are using them—and borrowing, too—to boost their stock prices and executives’ compensation rather than invest. The United States registered its third-largest advanced technology trade deficit on record in February 2012. Growth of R&D workers in business is slowing. The growth rate dropped from 4.4 percent in the 1980s to 1.1 percent in the 2000s prior to the recession. Business investment will only gain and sustain momentum if businesses expect more sales in the future, which can come from stronger demand at home alongside increased exports. In the short term, export demand will face an uphill battle against Europe’s simmering banking crisis and China’s slowing growth. But Congress has the power to keep domestic sales strong by focusing policy on job creation and strengthening middle-class incomes. But weighing on the minds of business owners and investors is the impending fiscal cliff looming in early 2013. If Congress fails to act, fiscal contractions invoked in current law will shrink the U.S. economy by 4 percent on January 1. Fiscal restraint is already adding an estimated 1 percentage point or more to the U.S. unemployment rate—while productivity-enhancing investments are being cut, workers’ productive skills are withering on the vine. Progress made since the Great Recession in our foundation for productivity is at risk. Policymakers need to act now to ensure the United States makes investments for a competitive economy tomorrow. The numbers here explain why. Productivity slips but is recovering overall Worker productivity—the amount of goods and services produced in an hour of work in the nonfarm business economy—actually fell by 0.5 percent in the first quarter of 2012. Productivity in the U.S. economy now stands 6.9 percent larger than at the start of the Great Recession in December 2007. This growth pace, however, lags behind that of all previous business cycles of at least equal length. At the same point in the business cycle, productivity had increased by 9.3 percent on average for all prior post-World War II expansions and there was no business cycle of at least equal length when labor productivity gains have been as slow as in the current business cycle. Business investment decelerates, too Productivity growth in the economy overall tends to follow business investment with a long time lag—investments today lead to productivity growth one or two decades down the road. So low investment today will likely constrain productivity increases in the future. Even before the Great Recession, U.S. business investment ran at its lowest level relative to gross domestic product, or GDP—the sum of all goods and services produced by workers and equipment in the United States—since the late 1960s. The business cycle expansion from late 2001 through 2007 saw the slowest rate of net business investment—new capital investment less depreciation—in recorded history of the U.S. economy. The recession and financial crisis drove business investment even lower, but since March 2010 business investment has grown faster than overall U.S. GDP. But business investment in equipment decelerated to an annual growth rate of 1.7 percent in the first quarter of 2012, down from 7.5 percent in the fourth quarter of 2011. The first-quarter expansion in equipment investment was the slowest since the economy began expanding again in June 2009. The acceleration of business investment from the summer of 2009 onward coincided closely with American Reinvestment and Recovery Act spending on public investment and middle-class tax cuts. The Recovery Act propelled demand from private businesses for investment goods, which boosted equipment spending during the economic recovery. Financial games distract from business investment The low level of business investment has little to do with business profitability. The corporate profit rate in nonfinancial businesses, which fell to 1.8 percent of total assets in December 2008, has recovered and been consistently at or above 2.6 percent through 2011. Rather than hiring productive workers or making substantial new investments, though, businesses are directing resources toward nonproductivity-enhancing uses. First, businesses are hoarding more than $2.2 trillion in cash, which amounted to 7.5 percent of their total assets as of December 2011—their highest level since December 1956. Second, rather than hiring or investing, corporations are using strong profits and borrowing money to prop up their stock prices—a key factor in executive compensation—by repurchasing their own shares and paying out dividends. In total corporations devoted resources worth 109 percent of after-tax profits to propping up share prices since December 2007. Together, this means corporations are borrowing money and selling off assets in order to buy back their own shares and pay dividends, rather than putting that money into productivity-enhancing investments or hiring workers. Venture capital getting less adventurous Funding by venture capital investors, though recovering strongly through the end of 2011, slowed somewhat in the four quarters through March 2012. On an annual basis, venture capital investors put $28.4 billion into new and young ventures. Venture capital funding is up nearly 40 percent from its low point during the recession and is close but still below the levels of investment before the financial turmoil of 2008. Though venture capital funding overall is recovering, venture investors are showing aversion to helping new and early-stage companies get off the ground. Financing for expansion and late-stage venture capital investments is up 41 percent from its recession nadir. Over the same time, meanwhile, financing for seed-stage companies is down 48 percent. What this means is that many viable and transformational innovations are potentially not being brought to market because of the private sector’s unwillingness to finance such investments. High-tech trade deficit moving in the wrong direction The U.S. trade deficit in advanced technology goods—such as aircraft, optical equipment, electronics, and medical devices—improved to just more than $99 billion in the 12 months through February 2012, the last month for which we have data. This is the second consecutive month of an improving high-tech trade deficit. The recent performance reverses what has been a longer-term trend of a deteriorating high-tech trade position for the United States. Over the past two years, U.S. imports of advanced technology goods grew more than twice as fast as the already-smaller exports of high-tech goods, at 6.4 percent and 2.5 percent, respectively, on an annualized basis. And despite the recent improvement, the 12 months through February 2012 mark the third-largest high-tech trade deficit on record. But the longer-term deterioration of the high-tech trade deficit is not a result of the overall direction of other U.S. trade. Compared to other U.S. exports, which grew more than 16 percent annually over the past two years, high-tech exports are growing slowly. This means that even though U.S. exports overall are becoming more competitive in the global marketplace, the U.S. high-tech sector is not keeping pace. Lagging performance of advanced technology trade also weighs on the overall U.S. trade deficit, amounting to 13.4 percent of the overall trade deficit in the year through February 2012. American innovation competitiveness hampered by shrinking technological workforce and declining patent grants The number of grants for utility patents from the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office grew 22 percent in 2011 to more than 224,000 patents. Utility patents are special property rights awarded to individuals or organizations for the invention of “new and useful” or material improvements of processes, machines, or materials—namely innovations. Not all patents represent productivity-enhancing innovation, however, and the timing of patent grants may not coincide with the timing of invention. Nonetheless, the pace of patent awards provides a metric of the pace of innovation in the U.S. economy. Even though patents overall were up in 2011, the share of patents awarded to domestic U.S. entities continued to decline. Under U.S. law both Americans and foreigners can apply for patent rights. Of new patent awards in 2011, 52 percent were granted to foreign entities; in 2000 foreign entities earned only 46 percent of all patent awards. The slowing growth of technological workers is hampering the relative pace of innovation in the U.S. economy, too. In 2003 the United States had 1.43 million people working in research and development. But by 2007, at the last peak of economic expansion, employers in the United States employed only 1.41 million R&D workers. In the private-sector economy, the average annual growth rate of U.S. R&D employment fell from 4.4 percent in the 1980s to 3.1 percent in the 1990s to 1.1 percent in the 2000s prior to the recession. Innovations from abroad can still confer substantial benefits on the U.S. economy. By making new technologies or practices available to domestic businesses and consumers, foreign innovations can enhance business productivity and boost living standards for U.S. households. But homegrown innovation remains critical to U.S. global science and technology leadership, and the rising awards of patents to foreign innovators signals an increasingly competitive international landscape for innovation. Conclusion The U.S. economy will not regain its competitive edge on its own. Policymakers must refocus their sights on ensuring we make the necessary investments today in education, science, and research and development that play an essential role in driving private-sector innovation and productivity, thus ensuring long-term growth and prosperity for the U.S. economy.

### Growth Adv – Internal Link Magnifier

#### Positive growth is the only way to stave off recession – this answers their takeouts and collapse inevitable claims.

Robert Reich, Chancellor's Professor of Public Policy at the University of California and former U.S. Secretary of Labor, “Why Europe's double dip could lead to one here”, 5-2-2012, Baltimore Sun, http://articles.baltimoresun.com/2012-05-02/news/bal-robert-b-reich-why-europes-double-dip-could-lead-to-one-here-20120501\_1\_double-dip-smaller-debt-global-economy]

Even if the U.S. economy (as well as President Barack Obama's re-election campaign) survives Europe's recession, we have our own big dose of austerity economics coming in less than eight months -- when drastic spending cuts are scheduled to kick in, as well as tax increases on the middle class. But the U.S. economy isn't healthy enough to bear this burden. That means a double-dip recession. Policymakers in the United States and in Europe should abandon austerity economics. Instead, set targets for growth and unemployment. Continue to increase government spending and reduce long-term interest rates until those targets are met. Only then adopt austerity. It may be too late for Europe, but it's not too late for us. We don't have to follow Europe off the cliff.

#### **It’s not a question of rail vs. alternatives, but of balance and synergy – the squo’s lopsidedness towards auto and aviation guarantees we will continue to economically lag.**

Representative Albio Sires (D-NJ), “Making High-Speed Rail a National Priority”, The Hill’s Congress Blog, 3-14-2011, http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/economy-a-budget/149263-making-high-speed-rail-a-national-priority

Infrastructure investments not only create jobs, but prepare our country for future global competition. Throughout the world, countries are investing in rails, roads, and air travel. It is important that our country is, at the very least, keeping up with the progress of other nations. During the past 50 years, the United States has invested nearly $1.3 trillion in our highways and over $484 billion in our aviation infrastructure. In contrast, rail investment has received only $67 billion over the past 31 years. We have directed significantly less funding to rail, despite the fact that some regions could benefit greatly from this investment. My district, New Jersey’s 13th Congressional district, is located on the Northeast Corridor, and I travel home to my constituents every weekend on Amtrak. The Northeast Corridor stretches from Washington, DC to Boston, MA, and is our nation’s most densely populated transportation corridor. Amtrak, freight, and commuter lines use the tracks along with the Acela Express, which can reach speeds of 150 miles per hour. However, due to infrastructure barriers such as aging catenary wires, tunnels, and relatively sharp curves, this speed is unattainable for most of the trip. Despite these barriers, Amtrak has been able to capture 69% of the air/rail market share between Washington, DC and New York, NY. This demonstrates the great interest in, and potential of, high speed rail.

### Growth Adv – Competitiveness Key to Heg

#### Competitiveness is key to heg.

Leslie Gelb, a former NYTimes Columnist and Senior Official in the State and Defense Departments, Currently President Emeritus of the Council on Foreign Relations, “Fashioning a Realistic Strategy for the Twenty-First Century”, Summer 2010, Fletcher Forum of World Affairs Volume 34:2, http://fletcher.tufts.edu/forum/archives/pdfs/34-2pdfs/Gelb.pdf

Power is what it always has been. It is the ability to get someone to do something they do not want to do by means of your resources and your position. It was always that. There is no such thing in my mind as “soft” power or “hard” power or “smart” power or “dumb” power. It is people who are hard or soft or smart or dumb. Power is power. And people use it wisely or poorly. Now, what has changed is the composition of power in international affairs. For almost all of history, international power was achieved in the form of military power and military force. Now, particularly in the last fifty years or so, it has become more and more economic. So power consists of economic power, military power, and diplomatic power, but the emphasis has shifted from military power (for almost all of history) to now, more economic power. And, as President Obama said in his West Point speech several months ago, our economy is the basis of our international power in general and our military power in particular. That is where it all comes from. Whether other states listen to us and act on what we say depends a good deal on their perception of the strength of the American economy. A big problem for us in the last few years has been the perception that our economy is in decline.

#### Economic dominance is essential – augments information tech and skilled labor – key to all security policy.

Barry R. Posen, Polisci Prof @ MIT, “Command of the Commons: The Military Foundations of US Hegemony”, Published in “New Global Dangers: Changing Dimensions of International Security”, 2004, MIT Press, p. 8)

What are the sources of U.S. command of the commons? One obvious source is the general U.S. superiority in economic resources. According to the Central Intelligence Agency, the United States produces 23 percent of gross world product (GWP); it has more than twice as many resources under the control of a single political authority as either of the next two most potent economic powers -- Japan with 7 percent of GWP and China with 10 percent. n14 With 3.5 percent of U.S. gross domestic product devoted to defense (nearly 1 percent of GWP), the U.S. military can undertake larger projects than any other military in the world. The specific weapons and platforms needed to secure and exploit command of the commons are expensive. They depend on a huge scientific and industrial base for their design and production. In 2001 the U.S. Department of Defense budgeted nearly as much money for military research and development as Germany and France together budgeted for their entire military efforts. n15 The military exploitation of information technology, a field where the U.S. military excels, is a key element. The systems needed to command the commons require significant skills in systems integration and the management of large-scale industrial projects, where the U.S. defense industry excels. The development of new weapons and tactics depends on decades of expensively accumulated technological and tactical experience embodied in the institutional memory of public and private military research and development organizations. n16 Finally, the military personnel needed to run these systems are among the most highly skilled and highly trained in the world. The barriers to entry to a state seeking the military capabilities to fight for the commons are very high.

### Growth Adv – Competitiveness Key to Heg

Technology development is essential – only possible in a competitive economy.

Adam Segal, Senior Fellow in China Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations, November/December 2004, “Is America Losing Its Edge?,” Foreign Affairs, http://www.foreignaffairs.org/20041101facomment83601/adam-segal/is-america-losing-its-edge.html?mode=print

The United States' global primacy depends in large part on its ability to develop new technologies and industries faster than anyone else. For the last five decades, U.S. scientific innovation and technological entrepreneurship have ensured the country's economic prosperity and military power. It was Americans who invented and commercialized the semiconductor, the personal computer, and the Internet; other countries merely followed the U.S. lead. Today, however, this technological edge-so long taken for granted-may be slipping, and the most serious challenge is coming from Asia. Through competitive tax policies, increased investment in research and development (R&D), and preferential policies for science and technology (S&T) personnel, Asian governments are improving the quality of their science and ensuring the exploitation of future innovations. The percentage of patents issued to and science journal articles published by scientists in China, Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan is rising. Indian companies are quickly becoming the second-largest producers of application services in the world, developing, supplying, and managing database and other types of software for clients around the world. South Korea has rapidly eaten away at the U.S. advantage in the manufacture of computer chips and telecommunications software. And even China has made impressive gains in advanced technologies such as lasers, biotechnology, and advanced materials used in semiconductors, aerospace, and many other types of manufacturing. Although the United States' technical dominance remains solid, the globalization of research and development is exerting considerable pressures on the American system. Indeed, as the United States is learning, globalization cuts both ways: it is both a potent catalyst of U.S. technological innovation and a significant threat to it. The United States will never be able to prevent rivals from developing new technologies; it can remain dominant only by continuing to innovate faster than everyone else. But this won't be easy; to keep its privileged position in the world, the United States must get better at fostering technological entrepreneurship at home.

### **Environment Adv – Warming Real/Increasing**

#### Warming real and increasing – IPCC studies prove.

US Department of Transportation, “Transportation’s Role in Reducing U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions”, Volume 1, April 2010, http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/32000/32700/32779/DOT\_Climate\_Change\_Report\_-\_April\_2010\_-\_Volume\_1\_and\_2.pdf

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) estimates that in the absence of additional climate policies to reduce GHG emissions, baseline global GHG emissions from human sources will increase between 25 percent and 90 percent between 2000 and 2030, with CO2 emissions from energy use growing between 40 and 110 percent over the same period. The IPCC projects that global temperatures will rise between 2°F to 11.5°F by 2100, and global sea level will rise between 7 to 23 inches. More recent estimates that include the effects of polar ice sheet melting suggest a possible 3 to 4 foot sea level rise. According to the Intergovernmental Panel, global GHG emissions must be reduced to 50 to 85 percent below year 2000 levels by 2050 to limit warming to 2.0°C to 2.4°C (3.6°F to 4.3°F). To reach this target, GHG emissions from all sectors must be reduced through a multi-generational effort.

#### CO2 is 29% of the US’s greenhouse gas emissions – it’s comprises of 95% of transportation sector greenhouse gases.

US Department of Transportation, “Transportation’s Role in Reducing U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions”, Volume 1, April 2010, http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/32000/32700/32779/DOT\_Climate\_Change\_Report\_-\_April\_2010\_-\_Volume\_1\_and\_2.pdf

The primary greenhouse gases produced by the transportation sector are carbon dioxide (CO2), methane (CH4), nitrous oxide (N2O), and hydrofluorocarbons (HFC). Transportation GHG emissions account for 29 percent of total U.S. GHG emissions, and over 5 percent of global GHG emissions. Carbon dioxide, a product of fossil fuel combustion, accounts for 95 percent of transportation GHG emissions in the United States. Except otherwise noted, the estimates in this report account for “tailpipe” emissions from burning fossil fuels to power vehicles and do not account for greenhouse gases emitted through other transportation lifecycle processes, such as the manufacture of vehicles, the extraction and refining of fuels, and the construction and maintenance of transportation infrastructure.

#### That number is steadily increasing – non-aviation and non-automotive emissions account for less than 10% of our total emissions.

US Department of Transportation, “Transportation’s Role in Reducing U.S. Greenhouse Gas Emissions”, Volume 1, April 2010, http://ntl.bts.gov/lib/32000/32700/32779/DOT\_Climate\_Change\_Report\_-\_April\_2010\_-\_Volume\_1\_and\_2.pdf

Transportation GHG emissions have been growing steadily in recent decades. From 1990 to 2006 alone, transportation GHG emissions increased 27 percent, accounting for almost one-half of the increase in total U.S. GHG emissions for the period. In 2006, emissions from on-road vehicles accounted for 79 percent of transportation GHG emissions. Emissions from light-duty vehicles, which include passenger cars and light duty trucks (e.g., sport utility vehicles, pickup trucks, and minivans) accounted for 59 percent of emissions. Emissions from freight trucks accounted for 19 percent, and emissions from commercial aircraft (domestic and international) for 12 percent. Emissions from all other modes accounted for less than 10 percent of total emissions.

### Environment Adv – Rail Only Option

#### Rail is the only realistic option of decreasing US oil consumption.

Dr. Anthony Perl, Prof. of Urban Studies and Polisci @ Simon Fraser University in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, Director of the Urban Studies Program, “How green is high-speed rail?”, 11-19-2011, CNN, <http://www.cnn.com/2011/11/18/world/how-green-is-hsr/index.html>.

Any debate about the future of high-speed rail must consider where this mobility option fits into the 'big picture' of how transportation systems meet looming economic, energy and environmental challenges. In a world where 95% of motorized mobility is currently fueled by oil, high-speed rail offers a proven means of reducing dependence on this increasingly problematic energy source. This value of using proven electric propulsion technology should not be underestimated when both the time and money to deploy energy alternatives are in short supply.

#### Rail development paves the way to grid-connected traction – it’s the only realistic option of decreasing oil consumption.

Dr. Anthony Perl, Prof. of Urban Studies and Polisci @ Simon Fraser University in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, Director of the Urban Studies Program, “How green is high-speed rail?”, 11-19-2011, CNN, <http://www.cnn.com/2011/11/18/world/how-green-is-hsr/index.html>.

This value of using proven electric propulsion technology should not be underestimated when both the time and money to deploy energy alternatives are in short supply. In our recent book Transport Revolutions, Richard Gilbert and I documented the economic, environmental and political dividends to be gained from replacing the internal combustion engines powering today's aircraft, cars, and motor vehicles with traction motors that can be powered by multiple energy sources delivered through the electric grid. Since electricity is an energy carrier, it can be generated from a mix of sources that incorporate the growing share of geothermal, hydro, solar, and wind energy that will be produced in the years ahead. And because electric motors are three to four times more efficient than internal combustion engines, an immediate improvement will precede introducing renewable energy into transportation. Grid-connected traction offers the only realistic option for significantly reducing oil use in transportation over the next 10 years.

#### Rail systems provide a carbon-free alternative to aviation and auto travel.

Department of Treasury; Council of Economic Advisers. October 11, 2010. “An Economic Analysis of Infrastructure Investment.” Report by the Department of Treasury. <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/economic-policy/Documents/infrastructure_investment_report.pdf>.

The U.S. Department of Transportation is committed to reducing the impact of the Nation’s transportation system on climate change and is already taking action. The Department’s livability initiative, along with the Sustainable Communities Partnership with the EPA and HUD, supports low carbon transportation options, such as public transportation, walking and biking. The partnership also promotes mixed-use development that enables residents to easily access goods and services. As shown by this study, all of these actions can reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The Department’s high-speed rail initiative will also provide a low carbon travel alternative. Furthermore, in April 2010, the Department and EPA announced the final rulemaking for a national greenhouse gas and fuel economy program for cars and light-duty trucks. The DOT also received new statutory authority under the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to create a fuel efficiency program for medium and heavy duty vehicles and work trucks, which will result in new regulations. In aviation, DOT has put energy and environmental concerns at the core of NextGen—the initiative to modernize the U.S. air traffic system. Likewise, the Maritime Administration is focused on the potential of new technologies to reduce harmful emissions from marine diesel engines through cooperative efforts with the EPA and maritime industry.

### Environment Adv – AT: Transportation Standards Solve

#### High speed rail is vastly more efficient – better than alternatives – also the only way to decrease use of bad transportation methods.

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned, and Robert Lane. Policy Focus Report @ Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. 2011. “High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for US Policy Makers.” <http://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/1948_High-Speed-Rail>.

High-speed rail has the potential to provide greater environmental benefits and energy efficiencies than other modes of long distance travel. However, several conditions must be met to obtain these benefits. Energy efficiency and ridership: High-speed rail offers greater operating efficiency on a per passenger mile basis than competing modes, such as single-occupancy automobiles or airplanes that require significant amounts of fuel to get off the ground. For example, Shinkansen trains are estimated to use one-quarter the energy of airplanes and one-sixth that of private automobiles per passenger mile (JR Central 2011a). To achieve environmental benefits, highspeed trains must maximize load factors to realize the greatest efficiencies. As highspeed rail ridership increases, so does its relative energy efficiency, whereas a high-speed train carrying no passengers ceases to be efficient in any sense. In regions where the number of total trips is not growing, high-speed rail can bring about a net reduction of energy use through mode shift by capturing passengers from automobile or airplane trips. In regions like California where population and trips are projected to keep growing, highspeed rail can help reduce the energy and climate impacts on a per passenger basis through a combination of mode shift and attracting new passengers to high-speed rail.

#### We need to shift away from automotives entirely for successful decrease in emissions – rail is the only option.

Andy Kunz, President and CEO of the US High Speed Rail Association, “US High-Speed Rail: Time to Hop Aboard or Be Left Behind”, Yale E 360, 3-10-2011, http://e360.yale.edu/feature/us\_high-speed\_rail\_time\_to\_hop\_aboard\_or\_be\_left\_behind/2378/

Enhancing U.S. energy security is just one reason the country needs a state-of-the-art high-speed rail system, which by 2030 could transport millions of people each day between America’s cities. A national high-speed rail system would generate millions of jobs; help revive the country’s manufacturing sector by creating a new industry producing the trains, steel, and related components; alleviate pressure on a crumbling transportation infrastructure; and lessen the ever-worsening congestion on America’s highways and at its airports, where delays cause an estimated $156 billion in losses to the U.S. economy annually. And then there is climate change and the large-scale reduction of CO2 emissions that would result from the creation of an interstate high-speed rail system and the expansion of regional commuter rail systems.

#### Efficiency doesn’t check dependency – most of our oil is consumed by automotives.

Andy Kunz, President and CEO of the US High Speed Rail Association, “US High-Speed Rail: Time to Hop Aboard or Be Left Behind”, Yale E 360, 3-10-2011, http://e360.yale.edu/feature/us\_high-speed\_rail\_time\_to\_hop\_aboard\_or\_be\_left\_behind/2378/

The reasons that so many disparate interests support the creation of a national high-speed rail network are glaringly obvious, and are becoming more so by the day. The United States has become far too dependent on foreign oil, with Americans consuming six times more oil per capita than Europeans, who enjoy better, faster, and cheaper mobility. The U.S now spends up to $700 billion a year to import foreign oil, 70 percent of which is consumed by cars, trucks, and airplanes. Now, for the second time in less than three years, the price of oil has shot up past $100 a barrel, threatening the fragile economic recovery. And most experts agree that the world has passed the point of peak oil, which means that as demand soars and supplies dwindle, oil prices could hit $300 per barrel this decade.

### Oil Dependence – Add On

#### High speed rail is key to an economic shift out of fossil fuel use – it provides sustainable electrical grids.

Dr. Anthony Perl, Prof. of Urban Studies and Polisci @ Simon Fraser University in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, Director of the Urban Studies Program, “How green is high-speed rail?”, 11-19-2011, CNN, <http://www.cnn.com/2011/11/18/world/how-green-is-hsr/index.html>.

But grid-connected electric trains have been operating at scale and across continents for over a century. And when the Japanese introduced modern high-speed trains through their Shinkansen, in 1964, the utility of electric trains was greatly extended. Since the 1980s, countries across Asia and Europe have been building new high-speed rail infrastructure to deploy electric mobility between major cities up to 1,000 kilometers apart. For intercity trips between 200 and 1,000 kilometers, high-speed trains have proven their success in drawing passengers out of both cars and planes, as well as meeting new travel demand with a much lower carbon footprint than driving or flying could have done. If we are serious about reducing oil's considerable risks to global prosperity and sustainability, we will not miss the opportunity offered by high-speed rail to decrease transportation's oil consumption sooner, rather than later.

#### It’s try or die – economic collapse and oil wars inevitable without the shift – timeframe is a decade.

Dr. Anthony Perl, Prof. of Urban Studies and Polisci @ Simon Fraser University in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, Director of the Urban Studies Program, “How green is high-speed rail?”, 11-19-2011, CNN, <http://www.cnn.com/2011/11/18/world/how-green-is-hsr/index.html>.

If such a shift does not begin during this decade, the risk of a global economic collapse and/or geo-political conflict over the world's remaining oil reserves would become dangerously elevated. Making a significant dent in transportation's oil addiction within 10 years is sooner than fuel cells, biofuels, battery-electric vehicles and other alternative energy technologies will be ready to deliver change. Biofuels that could power aircraft now cost hundreds of dollars per gallon to produce. Batteries that a big enough charge to power vehicles between cities are still too big and expensive to make electric cars and buses affordable.

#### **Most likely cause of global war in the next century.**

Tamara Straus, writer for Alternet, “Resource Wars: An Interview with Michael Klare”, 5-1-2001, http://www.alternet.org/story/10797/?page=1

Klare's new book, Resource Wars, argues that resources -- water, timber, minerals and especially oil -- will be the main cause of strife in the post-Cold War era. Although domination of resources has always been central to government strategy, Klare believes this will become more true as the world population grows and resources become depleted. Gone will be the days of war waged for ideology. In its place will emerge a battle of economic interests with the earth's natural resources as the ultimate trophy. This may sound overly simplistic, but resource competitions are already sparking tension and conflict in every corner of the globe. The motivation behind the Persian Gulf War -- protection of U.S. oil interests in the Middle East -- is the best known example. Yet it is not the only one. Klare shows that the U.S. government (and foreign governments as well) are currently shifting their foreign policy strategy away from technology and alliance politics to oil-field protection and defense of maritime trade routes in the Caspian Sea region, the South China Sea, the offshore oil fields of Africa and, of course, the Persian Gulf.

### AT: T – Infrastructure

#### Counter-interpretation – transportation infrastructure refers to hardware for transportation systems – this includes railways, depot and tunnel infrastructure, management systems, and the trains themselves.

United Nations ESCAP, “III: Transport Infrastructure”, 2006, http://www.unescap.org/pdd/publications/themestudy2006/9\_ch3.pdf

For the purpose of this study, transport infrastructure refers to “hardware”, including roads, railways, bridges, tunnels, ports (for maritime and inland water transport), airports, urban transport infrastructure (mass transit systems), dry ports and inland container depots (intermodal infrastructure). It also includes signage and traffic management systems. It does not include mobile equipment, except for trains. “Software” issues are discussed in the study only to the extent that they create an environment conducive to investment in infrastructure, make more efficient the utilization of existing infrastructure (for example, repairs and maintenance) or facilitate the movement of goods, vehicles and people, thereby supporting trade, growth and mobility objectives. In other words, they have a direct bearing on type or volume of investments for “hardware”.

#### Building a railroad system is investment in transportation infrastructure – prefer this evidence because it equates our aff with investment, even if investment from the private sector looks different.

Department of the Treasury with the Council of Economic Advisers, “A New Economic Analysis of Infrastructure Investment”, Executive Report, 3-23-2012, http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/economic-policy/Documents/20120323InfrastructureReport.pdf

Investments in infrastructure allow goods and services to be transported more quickly and at lower costs, resulting in both lower prices for consumers and increased profitability for firms. Major transportation infrastructure initiatives include the building of the national railroad system in the 19th century and the creation of the Eisenhower Interstate System in the 1950s and 1960s. Observers have concluded that in both of these cases there was a causal link running from infrastructure investments to subsequent private sector productivity gains.6 Alternatively, it is possible that infrastructure investments occur when productivity gains are also likely to follow but for unrelated reasons. Determining causality is difficult.

#### Limiting the topic to preexisting infrastructure or commonly used infrastructure means there’s only two affs – highways and airplanes.

John Moteff, Claudia Copeland, and John Fischer, Resources Science and Industry Division @ FAS, “Critical Infrastructure: What Makes an Infrastructure Critical?”, 1-29-2003, FAS Report to Congress, http://www.fas.org/irp/crs/RL31556.pdf

Fortunately, a considerable amount of information that can be used to categorize infrastructure is already available at the federal level. For example, the Federal Highway Administration classifies highways by type and produces copious statistics about them. Some of this information could be quite useful in a discussion about which parts of the transportation infrastructure are most critical. The National Highway System, which is a category of roads that includes the interstate highway system, constitutes only 4% of the nation’s public road milage, but carries over 44% of all travel.25 A similar situation exists in the aviation system. Of the 546 commercial airports that had airline service in April 2001, fully 70% of all airline passenger boardings occurred at just 31 airports.26

### AT: T – Investment

#### Transportation investment includes both purchases of equipment and operation costs.

Glen Weisbrod, Economic Development Research Group Inc., “Economic Impact of Public Transportation Investment”, American Public Transportation Association, October 2009, <http://www.apta.com/resources/reportsandpublications/Documents/economic_impact_of_public_transportation_investment.pdf>.

Capital investment in public transportation supports purchases of equipment and facilities (including rolling stock, tracks, other guideways, rightsofway, control equipment, and construction of terminals, stations, parking lots, maintenance facilities and power generating facilities). Operations of public transportation services supports associated jobs (drivers, maintenance workers, administrative and other transportation agency workers) as well as purchases of supplies needed for continuing operations (including motor fuel, electric power, maintenance parts and materials, etc.) Thus, investment in public transportation projects and services can directly support short-term construction jobs and longerterm operations jobs, as well as purchases of products that lead to further indirect impacts on industry activity and jobs.

#### Transportation investment refers to addition assets for transportation services – this includes structures, vehicles, machinery, and equipment.

Patricia Hu, Director of the Bureau of Transportation Statistics, @ US Department of Transportation, “Measuring Transportation Investment: Challenges and Opportunities”, Research and Innovative Technology Administration, 2-9-2012, http://www.internationaltransportforum.org/Proceedings/InfrastructureInv/HU.pdf

Transportation investment is defined as additions to transportation fixed assets. Transportation fixed assets refer to: structures, motor vehicles, and other machinery and equipment that are used in the provision of transportation services for more than one year.”

#### Squo funding proves we meet investment.

Federal Railroad Administration, United States Department of Transportation, “High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail Program”, No date cited (last updated 2012), http://www.fra.dot.gov/rpd/passenger/2243.shtml

The HSIPR Program was created to help address the nation’s transportation challenges by making strategic investments in an efficient network of passenger rail corridors that connect communities across the country. These investments focus on three key objectives: Building new high-speed rail corridors that expand and fundamentally improve passenger transportation in the geographic regions they serve; Upgrading existing intercity passenger rail corridors to improve reliability, speed, and frequency of existing services; and Laying the groundwork for future high-speed rail services through corridor and state planning efforts. To meet these objectives and realize President Obama’s vision of giving 80% of Americans access to high-speed rail within the next 25 years, FRA has solicited applications for more than $10 billion in grant funding made available through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) and annual appropriations for FY 2009 and 2010. To date, 39 States, the District of Columbia, and Amtrak have submitted applications requesting more than $75 billion—well in excess of the available funding— for projects and corridors in every region of the country.

### AT: States CP – Permutation

#### Counterplan insufficient to ensure safety of rail systems – permutation is key.

Department of Treasury; Council of Economic Advisers. October 11, 2010. “An Economic Analysis of Infrastructure Investment.” Report by the Department of Treasury. <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/economic-policy/Documents/infrastructure_investment_report.pdf>.

In 2005, motor vehicle traffic crashes were the leading cause of death for every age 3 through 6 and 8 through 34. Though 2009 saw the lowest fatality and injury rates ever recorded, it is clear that we can still do better, as nearly 100 people die on our roadways every day. 46,47 Aging transportation infrastructure – whether it is our roadways, transit systems, or railways – increase safety risks because they lack proven countermeasures that are installed on newer systems and equipment. Devoting resources to raising existing transportation infrastructure to a state of good repair in a “fix-it-first” approach is a sound strategy to help address critical safety challenges. The Federal Government, along with State, local, and private owners and operators of transportation infrastructure, must work together to target resources to risks before they become safety hazards.

#### **Federal commitment is key to making state action successful – the aff results in the CP, but not the other way around.**

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned, and Robert Lane. Policy Focus Report @ Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. 2011. “High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for US Policy Makers.” <http://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/1948_High-Speed-Rail>.

Moreover, as long as the HSIPR Program combines funding for both high-speed and conventional rail, federal grants, not loans, will be required to support its initiatives. Since conventional rail services are likely to need continued operating subsidies, it is even more important to secure a federal funding source for capital infrastructure costs. A small but reliable transportation tax for high-speed and conventional passenger rail would demonstrate the federal government’s commitment to a comprehensive rail program, giving states the assurance they need to plan high-speed rail projects and equipment manufacturers the confidence they require to invest in the industry.

#### State action promotes indecision – the federal government should take the initiative first.

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned, and Robert Lane. Policy Focus Report @ Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. 2011. “High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for US Policy Makers.” <http://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/1948_High-Speed-Rail>.

STRENGTHEN THE FEDERAL POLICY AND MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK The Passenger Rail Investment Improvement Act (PRIIA) is well-suited to support incremental investments in conventional passenger rail corridors, but it does not provide a sufficient policy or management framework to achieve the potential benefits of Core Express high-speed rail. Building on that act, an expanded federal role is needed to plan, prioritize, and commit to investments in high-speed rail and overcome the challenges of managing multistate capital programs and operations. Rather than wait for states to submit applications for federal funding for high-speed rail, the federal government should identify corridors with the greatest chance of meeting its goals and work with the states to secure rights-of-way for implementation.

### AT: States CP – Solvency Deficits

#### Well-connected stations critical – must be uniform – key to urban revitalization – careful planning requires national actor.

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned, and Robert Lane. Policy Focus Report @ Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. 2011. “High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for US Policy Makers.” <http://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/1948_High-Speed-Rail>.

To reap the greatest benefits, high-speed rail investments should be coupled with policies that encourage land development around rail stations. Careful planning must be undertaken for track alignment, station location, and connections with other transportation modes. In general, well-connected stations in center-city locations, when coupled with other investments, offer the greatest potential for urban revitalization. Peripheral station locations should be avoided, as they are rarely successful in maximizing transportation and other land development benefits and may have negative impacts on center-city station areas. Although high-speed rail service by itself will not necessarily induce development, it can contribute to the success of a larger urban redevelopment plan that includes collateral investments and policies.

#### The fed is key – Congress must act – the plan would provide money guarantees and transportation project support which would successfully expand the program.

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned, and Robert Lane. Policy Focus Report @ Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. 2011. “High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for US Policy Makers.” <http://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/1948_High-Speed-Rail>.

While passage of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act in 2009 marked a new period of federal funding for highspeed and passenger rail, the elimination of funds for the HSIPR Program in the FY 2011 budget underscores the need for a sustainable revenue source to ensure long-term success. Such a commitment will not be possible with unpredictable appropriations, which have ranged widely from $8 billion in 2009 to negative $400 million in 2011. The need to find a long-term solution for the nation’s transportation funding presents the opportunity to address existing surface transportation needs and high-speed and passenger rail at the same time. When Congress addresses the current shortfall in transportation funding, it should also dedicate funding for passenger rail, such as by raising the gas tax by 15 cents and directing several cents to rail, or considering new approaches entirely—such as an upstream oil tax or VMT fee. A national infrastructure bank could provide loans, grants, and credit assistance for transportation projects at a regional or national scale, covering large upfront costs while encouraging collaboration among state, local, and private investors. Two existing federal loan programs for transportation, TIFIA and RRIF, could be expanded for financing high-speed rail, and new programs such as Build America Bonds and other qualified tax credit bonds could attract a wide range of private investors.

### AT: States CP – Solvency Deficits

#### Independent state action collapses California’s economy and leads to lumping – prevents solvency.

Fawn Johnson, Correspondent for the National Journal, “High-Speed Rail in a Coma”, The National Journal Transportation Experts Blog, 1-17-2012, http://transportation.nationaljournal.com/2012/01/highspeed-rail-in-a-coma.php

The problems continue at the state level, particularly in California. The California High Speed Rail Peer Review Group recently refused to recommend that bond money be devoted to the state's high-speed rail plan. The review group said the state's business plan lacked "credible sources of adequate funding" that posed "an immense financial risk" to California. Democratic Gov. Jerry Brown proposed folding the California High-Speed Rail Authority into a broader transportation agency to save money. That move could potentially take some steam out of the state's high-speed rail initiatives as they get lumped in with other transportation priorities. Even so, more than $3.5 billion in federal funding could be at risk if the state Legislature doesn't approve funds for a high-speed rail line, according to Sen. Dianne Feinstein, D-Calif.

### AT: Freight Shipping DA

#### High speed rail boosts freight shipping by freeing track that otherwise would accommodate passengers and shipping.

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned, and Robert Lane. Policy Focus Report @ Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. 2011. “High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for US Policy Makers.” <http://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/1948_High-Speed-Rail>.

Capacity: By adding capacity to the railway network, high-speed rail can divert a large share of passenger rail service to new, dedicated tracks, thus freeing up capacity on the conventional rail network for freight and other intercity and commuter rail services. For example, the United Kingdom has chosen to address capacity constraints on its West Coast Main Line with the implementation of the proposed High Speed 2 (HS2) line. In Japan, the main motivation for implementing the Tokaido line between Tokyo and Osaka was to provide additional capacity to the transportation network, rather than to reduce travel times (Givoni 2006). Efficient land use: A typical highspeed rail line has the ability to transport approximately the same number of people in the same direction as a three-lane highway, but on a fraction of the land area. The right-of-way width of a typical two-track high-speed rail line is about 82 feet—onethird the width of a standard six-lane highway (246 feet). This difference in land use amounts to a savings of 24.3 acres per mile of high-speed rail. Such a savings could be particularly significant in environmentally sensitive areas that need protection and in urbanized areas where land for highway expansion is costly to acquire (UIC 2010a).

Freight regulations already hurts it – also non-uniques any link to perception of the plan.

Yonah Freemark, Writer for the Transport Politic, “The US Emphasis on Passenger Rail and the Future of Freight”, 7-24-2010, The Transport Politic, http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2010/07/24/the-u-s-emphasis-on-passenger-rail-and-the-future-of-freight/

Will those improvements, however, come to the detriment of freight service? The Economist addressed that issue this week in a shock article that suggests that passenger rail is not directly compatible with cargo. The industry, already worried that the government is planning re-regulation (the railroads were deregulated in 1980), is convinced that its willingness to allow Amtrak on its tracks costs $240 million in lost fees each year, and it has already been subjected to a required $15 billion upgrade to install positive train control.

#### **Freight and passenger rail operate in different places – no tradeoff.**

Yonah Freemark, Writer for the Transport Politic, “The US Emphasis on Passenger Rail and the Future of Freight”, 7-24-2010, The Transport Politic, http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2010/07/24/the-u-s-emphasis-on-passenger-rail-and-the-future-of-freight/

Fortunately, the situation is not nearly as dire as the Economist suggests. For one, the vast majority of freight movements are through rural areas in the Western U.S., few of which are likely to see many passenger trains any time in the next century. Second, the true high-speed rail lines first planned for California and Florida will feature brand-new track, doing little to freight services. Third, with appropriate coordination between freight companies and the passenger services — such as promoting shipping during the night (done on New Jersey’s RiverLine corridor) — many problems could be avoided.

### AT: Politics DA – Plan Popular

#### Plan is massively popular – business lobbies, labor lobbies, bipartisan commissions, US Chamber of Commerce.

Department of Treasury; Council of Economic Advisers. October 11, 2010. “An Economic Analysis of Infrastructure Investment.” Report by the Department of Treasury. <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/economic-policy/Documents/infrastructure_investment_report.pdf>.

The business and labor communities have also expressed a desire for more transportation infrastructure investment. Proposals from the American Public Transport Association (APTA), the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO), the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and AFL-CIO call for greater infrastructure investment. APTA advocates for nearly $15 billion of investment for federal public transportation programs, and at least $2.5 billion to be put towards high speed and intercity rail systems. AASHTO reported in 2009 that between $132 billion and $166 billion of investment is necessary to rebuild and repair America’s highways.33 The view that more transportation infrastructure is necessary is consistent with other research, including the recently issued bi-partisan report by two former Secretaries of Transportation, Norman Mineta and Samuel Skinner. Their report estimated that an additional investment of $134 to $194 billion per year is needed to maintain our transportation system, and an even larger sum, from $189 to $262 billion, would be needed to improve it.34 The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has stated that “to have a transportation system that supports a 21st century economy, the United States needs a high level of investment targeted at improving performance across all modes and geographies. There can be no more business as usual.”35

#### Previous funding proves popularity of the plan.

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned, and Robert Lane. Policy Focus Report @ Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. 2011. “High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for US Policy Makers.” <http://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/1948_High-Speed-Rail>.

In 2009–2010, the U.S. Congress appropriated $10.1 billion for a new high-speed and intercity passenger rail program. Applications from 39 states requested nearly $75 billion, demonstrating broad interest in and support for this program. The available funds were awarded to dozens of conventional intercity passenger rail projects and a few dedicated high-speed rail projects in 32 states and the District of Columbia, and those projects are now moving forward.

### AT: Politics DA – Plan Popular

#### Massive support for the plan – critics are shielded via articulation of travel, land, and economic feasibility.

Petra Todorovich, Daniel Schned, and Robert Lane. Policy Focus Report @ Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. 2011. “High-Speed Rail: International Lessons for US Policy Makers.” <http://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/1948_High-Speed-Rail>.

The United States has been slow to invest in high-speed rail, but planning and policy making are now being pursued more seriously. In 2009 and 2010, the U.S. Congress appropriated $10.1 billion toward a new, competitive grant program for high-speed rail, and President Barack Obama’s 2012 budget proposal assigns $53 billion over the following six years to begin developing a national high-speed and conventional passenger rail network that could connect up to 80 percent of Americans. Broad support for the program across the country is evident in the 39 states that applied for funding since 2009, yet that support is not universal. Some critics have labeled it wasteful, lacking focus, or failing to aim for “true” high-speed technology (Laing 2011a). The fledging program has experienced its share of growing pains because the recent $10.1 billion infusion has required simultaneous planning, policy making, and grant administration by the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Railroad Administration (FRA). The agency has adapted quickly, but these tasks are far outside FRA’s traditional role of enforcing safety regulations on America’s railroads. To build and sustain support for a longterm commitment to develop a national high-speed rail network in America, proponents will need to lay out a compelling case for its benefits, particularly those related to U.S. travel behaviors, land use patterns, and urban and regional economies. Chapter 2 outlines potential benefits based on the experiences of other countries in building and operating high-speed rail systems since the 1960s, and the following sections introduce some characteristics of high-speed rail.

### AT: Politics DA – Thumpers

#### Link non-unique – Obama still pushing the plan in congress.

Keith Laing, Staff Writer for The Hill (blog), “Obama administration officials to speak at high-speed rail conference”, The Hill’s Transportation, 5-30-2012, <http://thehill.com/blogs/transportation-report/railroads/230145-obama-administration-officials-to-speak-at-high-speed-rail-conference>

The Obama administration has maintained its push for high-speed rail in the face of staunch opposition from Republicans in Congress and in state governments. The president called early in the first half of his tenure in office for a nationwide network of high-speed railways that he said would rival the reach of the interstate highway system, and he included $8 billion for construction in the 2009 economic stimulus.

#### Lobbying will continue – despite Republican opposition.

Keith Laing, Staff Writer for The Hill (blog), “Obama administration officials to speak at high-speed rail conference”, The Hill’s Transportation, 5-30-2012, <http://thehill.com/blogs/transportation-report/railroads/230145-obama-administration-officials-to-speak-at-high-speed-rail-conference>

But the money was rejected by three prominent Republican governors, and GOP members in the House moved successfully last year to eliminate future funding for high-speed rail. Republicans on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee have argued that high-speed rail only makes sense in the densely populated Northeast U.S. However, organizers of the high-speed rail conference in Philadelphia are promising "the world’s largest global gathering focused around successful strategies, latest developments, best practices and innovative technologies in high-speed rail."

#### High speed rail fights inevitable with the transportation bill.

Thomas Hart Jr., Writer for Politico, “High-speed rail’s many benefits”, Opinion, 5-23-2012, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/0512/76682.html

Even as Congress looks into a new surface transportation bill, U.S. transportation systems confront daunting challenges of overcrowding and disrepair. Delays and waste cost the nation more than $100 billion per year in lost time, productivity and energy. The U.S. needs modern public transportation not dependent on oil or traffic patterns. Most developed nations now have high-speed rail, sleek trains that reach more than 200 mph. Here, this option would be most viable in two distinct corridors on the East and West Coasts – the Northeast Corridor, from Boston to Washington, and California. The Northeast Corridor is already one of most valuable U.S. transportation assets. With I-95, it’s the only continuous link between the major population centers of Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York and Boston. This is the nation’s most densely populated region with 18 percent of the U.S. population living in just 2 percent of its land area. The NEC region alone would be the world’s sixth-largest economy, with a gross domestic product of $2.59 trillion. The NEC is already a mature rail corridor — Amtrak and regional rail services show ridership spikes whenever gas prices increase. Amtrak’s Acela service, however, averages only 80 mph. True high-speed rail in this corridor could prove competitive with air travel, particularly because rail can easily connect to other local and regional transit networks. There is growing consensus among Democrats and Republicans in Congress that the NEC is ideally suited for high-speed rail development. Differences remain, however, on the best path for development.

### AT: Spending DA – Link Turns

#### No link and turn – plan creates a massive economic boost and unemployment means training and labor would be super cheap.

Department of Treasury; Council of Economic Advisers. October 11, 2010. “An Economic Analysis of Infrastructure Investment.” Report by the Department of Treasury. <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/economic-policy/Documents/infrastructure_investment_report.pdf>.

There is currently a large pool of unemployed and underemployed labor available to improve our infrastructure. Building more roads, bridges, and rail tracks would especially help the segment of workers that was most disproportionately affected by the economic crisis – construction and manufacturing workers. The recession that started in late 2007 had an exceptionally large impact on the labor market. The U.S. lost over 8 million jobs between December 2007 and December 2009. Fully 21 percent of those who lost jobs were in the construction industry. Due to the collapse of the real estate market, the contraction of employment in the construction industry was especially acute. Since December 2007, the construction industry has lost 25 percent of its total payroll jobs, dropping from 7.5 million to 5.6 million employees. In August 2010, the unemployment rate for construction workers stood at 17 percent. This is over three times the rate from three years ago, and almost double the overall unemployment rate. Accelerated infrastructure investment would provide an opportunity for construction workers to productively apply their skills and experience. Moreover, hiring currently unemployed construction workers would impose lower training costs on firms than would be incurred by hiring workers during normal times, because these workers already have the requisite skills and experience in construction. The excess supply of construction workers is one of many factors making current construction costs low. This is translating to lower project costs. For example, the Federal Aviation Administration received $1.1 billion in Recovery Act funds for airport improvements. The money was designated for 300 projects. The winning bids for those projects came in over $200 million below the engineers' estimates. A second round of projects was selected, which also received lower bids than anticipated. As a result of these cost savings, 367 runway and airport improvement projects were funded with the money that was originally intended to support 300 projects.

#### High speed rail development is inevitable – we only gain economic benefits by investing now – costs of delay outweigh the costs of development.

Gene Richards, Visiting Editor with The Modesto Bee and a commercial aviator for 38 years, “High-speed rail is long overdue in the United States”, 3-28-2012, The Modesto Bee, http://www.modbee.com/2012/03/28/2133835/high-speed-rail-is-long-overdue.html

We should not ask how much this project will cost. We should ask how much it will cost to ignore it. HSR will jump-start access to labor markets and consolidate higher-end business, financial and cultural services. Los Angles alone will see $7.5 billion in sales, 55,000 jobs and $3 billion in wages per year. San Francisco and Oakland should see at least half as much, and the Central Valley is the nerve fiber that glues it all together. The effectiveness of HSR upon regional economic growth depends on connections between HSR stations and the surrounding area. If we start today, by the time HSR is complete, California's population will be approaching 50 million. HSR will inevitably be built in the United States. It is up to California voters to see that California gets its fair share. Let's not be like the economist who told the doctor, "I'll put off that appendectomy until a more convenient time and better price."

### AT: Spending DA – Link Turns

#### **Costs for the system go down each year the system is running.**

Andy Kunz, President and CEO of the US High Speed Rail Association, “US High-Speed Rail: Time to Hop Aboard or Be Left Behind”, Yale E 360, 3-10-2011, http://e360.yale.edu/feature/us\_high-speed\_rail\_time\_to\_hop\_aboard\_or\_be\_left\_behind/2378/

As a high-speed rail network spreads across the U.S. in the coming decades, the costs of operating the national transportation system will decline each year to the point where the savings will eventually exceed the estimated $600 billion cost of building the rail system. Although public funds will be used to cover much of the construction costs, the network will perform best if operated by private companies.

### AT: Kritiks (General)

#### Strategic investment in railroads connects Americans in new ways – this is key to sustaining communities and economic growth.

Department of Treasury; Council of Economic Advisers. October 11, 2010. “An Economic Analysis of Infrastructure Investment.” Report by the Department of Treasury. <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/economic-policy/Documents/infrastructure_investment_report.pdf>.

The advent of railroads brought time standardization to the United States. Before rail travel was available, cities and towns across America set their clocks based on local sunrises and sunsets. However, the lack of time coordination across cities caused rail travelers considerable confusion.23 To address this issue, railroad managers developed the current nationwide time system with four distinct time zones to allow for a uniform schedule for arrivals and departures. Thus, the development of rail lines furthered the goal of a national community by allowing people and goods to travel quickly from one place to another, reducing the time to travel across the country from five to six months to just five days and by leading to the development of a national time standard. Just as the development of railroads provided greater opportunities for Americans, boosted economic productivity, and helped build a national community in the past, increased investment in transportation infrastructure can provide these same benefits today. Research has found significant benefits from increased agglomeration of people, firms and industrial activity, particularly in manufacturing.24 Strategic investments in infrastructure can help connect Americans in new ways to sustain communities and increase economic growth**.**

#### **Plan doesn’t bolster the ideology they’re criticizing – rather, it eliminates risk and increases general well-being of individuals in a market economy.**

Ron Wheeler, President of Artifact Software Inc., “Self-Interest Ontology”, 11-7-2011, Ontolog, http://ontolog.cim3.net/forum/ontolog-forum/2011-11/msg00046.html

If your taxes remove non-productive money (off-shore assets, foreign travel, non-productive assets) and put it into productive efforts such as dam building, road building, public infrastructure, rail construction, etc. which are labour intensive and support a lot of private sector activity, you allow the private sector to expand and develop corporate and individual capabilities The private sector also gets the benefits of cheap power, more efficient roads, cheaper infrastructure costs, high-speed rail and lower freight costs, etc. that last a long time and build more wealth. It is not clear that this reduces economic markets at all. It just shuffles it about and removes the premium for financial risk which makes the projects move faster. It also broadens the tax base and improves the general sense of well-being in a country.

### AT: Kritiks (General)

#### We should work in the current system to dissolve oppression – high speed rail is a start – federal action is key and is a transformative shift from the current fossil-fuel economy that dooms us all.

Noam Chomsky, Professor @ MIT, “An Interview with Noam Chomsky”, Interview conducted by D.J. Buschini, 4-23-2012, Boston Occupier, http://bostonoccupier.com/2012/04/23/an-interview-with-noam-chomsky-working-for-revolutionary-peace/

NC: “Jobs,” in American speech, has a new meaning: “Jobs” is the way you pronounce an obscene word, namely “profits.” You can’t say “profits,” so nobody ever talks about that. What you say is “jobs,” and that sounds better than “profits.” What about work? There are very concrete questions, like: do we want higher employment right now, within the existing system of production (––or, in fact, the system of production that’s been substantially diminished and much of it sent overseas)? I think the answer is that it has to be modulated. There’s nothing wrong with having a decent job, the kind you like and gives you a way to live and so on. But does it have to be a job that’s contributing to the likely destruction of the possibility for decent survival not too many years down the road? Well, it doesn’t. There’s plenty of potential for employment which would overcome or reduce the threats of anthropogenic global warming––some of them pretty low-tech. Take, say, weatherizing houses. Lots of people could be put to work weatherizing houses; that would have a big effect. The automobile industry could [be] turned over to the stakeholders: the workforce and community, who could run it and manage it and use it to produce things that people really need and that, in fact, future generations need if they’re going to be able to survive. Like high-speed rail, instead of transportation geared to the maximal use of fossil fuels, which is what’s been going on for decades. So that could [be] done. The skilled workforce out in the Rust Belt could do that quite well, maybe with a little federal aid. But with the support of the public, and with the right kind of consciousness.

## Green Stimulus Aff

### 1AC Solvency

#### Current highway investments ignore environmental consequences

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 2008, “Exploring Green Highways,” Standardization News, http://www.astm.org/SNEWS/SO\_2008/bryce\_so08.html

Many technologies already exist to reduce the environmental impact of highways, such as the advanced planning, intelligent construction and efficient maintenance techniques commonly used in modern highway design. Yet current industry practice tends to focus on the short-term costs of road building, often neglecting ways to lower long-term or life cycle costs through more sustainable highway construction.

#### The United States federal government should substantially increase investment in sustainable highways.

#### The technology for the plan exists and will be used successfully

Madeline Fisher, UMW Staff, 5-27-2008, “Green highways: Research targets environmentally friendly asphalts,” UMW News, http://www.news.wisc.edu/15277

More than 90 percent of U.S. roadways are paved with asphalt, which means any modifications that boost its recycled content, lengthen its life, or cut the energy needed to manufacture it could have a big impact on the environment and our pocketbooks, says Bahia. One of his first goals is to develop so-called "cold mix" asphalts for widespread introduction into the United States. Places like Africa and India have used them for decades, and research shows they can save up to seven times the energy of their hot mix counterparts.

#### If given the appropriate funding, there are systems developed to promote sustainable highways

Art Hirsch, Staff at Terra Logic, 4-2011, “Sustainable Actions Associated with Highway Operation and Maintenance,” Terra Logic Press, http://terralogicss.com/\_blog/Sustainable\_Transportation/post/Sustainable\_Actions\_Associated\_with\_Highway\_Operation\_and\_Maintenance/

State maintenance departments are funded through state budgets and not federal budgets and many have been underfunded for years, well before hard economic times hit state DOTs. Transportation planning, NEPA and design documents do not adequately address this long term economic life cycle issue. If given the appropriate funding and support, highway maintenance departments can become more sustainable when considering community, economic, and environmental issues. Many sustainable actions are cost effective; however, in many cases there is a lack of short term money necessary to save long term money.

### 1AC Environment Advantage

#### Advantage One – Environment

#### Future highway construction is inevitable – the plan is necessary to promote ecologically sustainable transportation

Elizabeth Nanas, PhD Candidate @ Wayne State, and Tani Bellestri, copyeditor in Detroit, 2011, “Highways,” SAGE Reference Series on Green Society, http://enanas.files.wordpress.com/2011/06/highways\_nanasbellestri\_finaldraft.pdf

Global acceleration of vehicle use is also accelerating highway construction. Expansion and maintenance of highway transportation systems relies upon the manufacture of cement which, at every stage of the process, takes a toll on the environment. Generally, cement manufacture disrupts biodiversity across ecological spaces through the extraction of fuels and raw materials such as limestone, coal, and petroleum, which further contributes to greenhouse gas production. Beyond the damage caused by the manufacture of cement, its use as a material in highway construction also has severe implications for the environment. In contrast, emerging green highway concepts and innovations facilitate highway transportation system solutions that are ecologically sustainable.

#### Green highways are the next step towards sustainable infrastructure

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 8-2008, “Developing Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure,” WISE, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2008/JamesBryceFinal.pdf

A more sustainable solution to America’s infrastructure problems must be assessed. Highways have a large negative impact on surrounding ecosystems and overall environmental quality. The next step in highway infrastructure’s advancement needs to include practices that reduce the highways effect on the natural environment, increase capacity, and benefit society beyond the ability of current highways. This can be achieved by instituting a system of green highways.

#### Green highways are necessary to solve a range of biodiversity issues

Ben Cotton, MA, community planner with the Transportation Planning Division at the Volpe National Transportation Systems Center in Cambridge, 2011, “In Pursuit of Sustainable Highways,” Federal Highway Administration, http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/publicroads/11novdec/03.cfm

A sustainable approach looks at access (not just mobility), movement of people and goods (not just vehicles), and provision of transportation choices, such as safe and comfortable routes for walking, bicycling, and transit. Sustainability encapsulates a diversity of concepts as well, including efficient use of funding, incentives for construction quality, regional air quality, climate change considerations, livability, and environmental management systems.

### 1AC Environment Advantage

#### Biodiversity loss risks human survival

Jerry Coyne, Professor in the Department of Ecology and Evolution at the University of Chicago, and, Hopi Hoekstra, Associate Professor in the Department of Organismic and Evolutionary Biology at Harvard University, 9-24-2007, “The Greatest Dying,” The New Republic, http://www.truthout.org/article/jerry-coyne-and-hopi-e-hoekstra-the-greatestdying

But, whether or not one is moved by such concerns, it is certain that our future is bleak if we do nothing to stem this sixth extinction. We are creating a world in which exotic diseases flourish but natural medicinal cures are lost; a world in which carbon waste accumulates while food sources dwindle; a world of sweltering heat, failing crops, and impure water. In the end, we must accept the possibility that we ourselves are not immune to extinction.

#### Specifically – the plan substantially reduces greenhouse gas emissions

John Bartle, Professor of Public Administration @ U of Nebraska, and Jijesh Devan, PhD Candidate, 2006, “Sustainable Highways: Destination or Mirage?,” Public Works Management and Policy, vol. 3, issue 10

Making transportation policy more congruent with the goal of sustainable development is a persuasive policy goal, not only for ecological reasons but also for economic reasons, because it will maximize the return from all forms of capital. Incentives that lead to waste of any form of capital lead to lower long-term growth and a lower future quality of life. The path dependence of economic growth suggests that these incentives create a long-term distortion from which societies may not necessarily recover. Institutional reform, therefore, is central to the goal of using capital resources efficiently. Achieving this efficiency will not be done by a single policy approach because different institutional structures create different costs and incentives. Some current policies have moved in this direction, such as the environmental impact statement process, the subsidization of research and development in emissions reduction, noise reduction, and noise abatement, but there is still a long way to go. The looming threat of global climate change makes this reform one of the most important issues for the world today.

#### Global warming risks all of humanity

Jeffrey Mazo, Managing Editor, Survival and Research Fellow for Environmental Security and Science Policy at the International Institute for Strategic Studies in London, 3-2010, “Climate Conflict: How global warming threatens security and what to do about it,” pg. 122

Without early and severe reductions in emissions, the effects of climate change in the second half of the twenty-first century are likely to be catastrophic for the stability and security of countries in the developing world - not to mention the associated human tragedy. Climate change could even undermine the strength and stability of emerging and advanced economies, beyond the knock-on effects on security of widespread state failure and collapse in developing countries.' And although they have been condemned as melodramatic and alarmist, many informed observers believe that unmitigated climate change beyond the end of the century could pose an existential threat to civilisation."

### 1AC Economy Advantage

#### Advantage Two – Economy

#### Successfully constructed green highways are key to the national economy

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 8-2008, “Developing Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure,” WISE, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2008/JamesBryceFinal.pdf

The United States Highway system is a vast network that is vital to our nation’s economy. The construction of the Eisenhower Interstate System helped to spur the trade of commerce from a regional level to a national level. Unfortunately, the interstate system has had a negative effect on the natural environment. M.A. Aziz points out in the Handbook of Highway Engineering, “Highway development enhances mobility and is critical to the economic growth of a community and a country as a whole. Unfortunately, inappropriately planned, designed, and constructed highways can aggravate the conditions of the poor, and harm the natural and socio-economic environment .”

#### Specifically – plan is key to the manufacturing industry

Leslie Moody, Executive Director of the Partnership for Working Families, 2009, “A new urban agenda for America,” The Partnership, http://www.workingeastbay.org/downloads/A%20New%20Urban%20Agenda%20for%20America.pdf

Green industries provide a number of opportunities beyond the development of the energy efficient retrofits construction program, which is addressed above. The Obama Administration should develop middle class job opportunities in two additional green industries: green manufacturing and green goods movement. The federal government should incentivize the development of a high-road green manufacturing industry. Green jobs efforts have largely focused on construction and retrofitting, but green manufacturing provides a key opportunity for growth in the US economy and is essential to maximize the economic gains of the many green building initiatives. The Obama administration should encourage the growth of this industry as a way of modernizing the U.S. manufacturing economy, and with a goal of establishing high job quality standards, and creating a training pipeline and targeted hiring program that can engage low-income urban residents in new job opportunities.

#### The plan must come in the form of new stimulus

Robert Kuttner, MS in Economics, 4-1-2012, “Recipe for a Double-Dip Recession,” Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-kuttner/double-dip-recession\_b\_1395455.html

The trouble is that all of this adds up to a massive fiscal contraction. If you want to snuff out a fragile recovery, there is no better way than to cut spending and otherwise shrink the federal deficit prematurely. If anything, the economy needs more public spending for at least a year or two to compensate for the hit to private purchasing power and the housing collapse.

### 1AC Economy Advantage

#### It’s reverse causal, austerity leads to collapse

Robert Kuttner, MS in Economics, 4-1-2012, “Recipe for a Double-Dip Recession,” Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-kuttner/double-dip-recession\_b\_1395455.html

Interest rates have never been lower. This is the time for the Federal government to borrow a lot of money and to invest it in public improvements -- not as a one-shot but as a multi-year program that does not have to be instantly shovel-ready. The trouble with using deficit-reduction and ten-year debt goals as a recovery strategy is that the future deficit is itself a function of the growth rate. Squeeze too tightly, and economic growth slows down. Even though you cut spending, the deficit actually widens. This is the real lesson of Greece.

#### Economic decline leads to war

Earl Tilford, PhD in history from George Washington University and served for thirty-two years as a military officer and analyst with the Air Force and Army, 2008, “Critical Mass: Economic Leadership or Dictatorship,” The Cedartown Standard, pg. A7

If the American economy collapses, especially in wartime, there remains that possibility. And if that happens the American democratic era may be over. If the world economies collapse, totalitarianism will almost certainly return to Russia, which already is well along that path in any event. Fragile democracies in South America and Eastern Europe could crumble. A global economic collapse will also increase the chance of global conflict. As economic systems shut down, so will the distribution systems for resources like petroleum and food. It is certainly within the realm of possibility that nations perceiving themselves in peril will, if they have the military capability, use force, just as Japan and Nazi Germany did in the mid-to-late 1930s. Every nation in the world needs access to food and water. Industrial nations—the world powers of North America, Europe, and Asia—need access to energy. When the world economy runs smoothly, reciprocal trade meets these needs. If the world economy collapses, the use of military force becomes a more likely alternative. And given the increasingly rapid rate at which world affairs move; the world could devolve to that point very quickly.

#### This is empirically proven

Walter Russell Mead, Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow in U.S. Foreign Policy at the Council on Foreign Relations, 2-4-2009, “Only Makes You Stronger: Why the recession bolstered America,” The New Republic, pg. A3

History may suggest that financial crises actually help capitalist great powers maintain their leads--but it has other, less reassuring messages as well. If financial crises have been a normal part of life during the 300-year rise of the liberal capitalist system under the Anglophone powers, so has war. The wars of the League of Augsburg and the Spanish Succession; the Seven Years War; the American Revolution; the Napoleonic Wars; the two World Wars; the cold war: The list of wars is almost as long as the list of financial crises. Bad economic times can breed wars. Europe was a pretty peaceful place in 1928, but the Depression poisoned German public opinion and helped bring Adolf Hitler to power. If the current crisis turns into a depression, what rough beasts might start slouching toward Moscow, Karachi, Beijing, or New Delhi to be born? The United States may not, yet, decline, but, if we can't get the world economy back on track, we may still have to fight.

### Inherency – No Sustainable Highways

#### Current cost-benefit analysis excludes environmental priorities

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 8-2008, “Developing Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure,” WISE, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2008/JamesBryceFinal.pdf

In order to encourage sustainable development, green highway designs should be given first priority for federally and state funded projects instead of basing the decision mainly on cost. Unfortunately, many highway projects only have the capability to be evaluated on an initial cost basis, meaning that even if the future benefits can outweigh the initial cost, the project with the lowest initial cost is still typically selected. If a green highway’s cost cannot be justified by a lifecycle analysis, benefits to society due to sustainable practices need to be figured into the cost calculation.

#### Current approaches are purely voluntary

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 8-2008, “Developing Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure,” WISE, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2008/JamesBryceFinal.pdf

Constructing sustainable infrastructure is completely voluntary. In some cases the benefits of sustainable construction outweigh the costs, immediately justifying the use of sustainable products. However, in the cases where the benefits do not outweigh the cost, the contractor has no financial incentive to use sustainable methods in the highway construction. In such cases, tax benefits should be offered. Tax incentives will help offset the contractors cost as well as help in making constructing a more sustainable infrastructure become more appealing.

#### More efforts are necessary to create sustainable highways

Gloria Shepherd, First witness of Congressional Testimony, Associate Administrator for Planning, Environment, and Realty at the Federal Highway Administration, 5-2007, “Green Transportation Infrastructure,” Congressional Testimony, http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/science/hsy34909.000/hsy34909\_0f.htm

There has not been widespread implementation of green transportation infrastructure by governments or private industry. There are technical, social, and regulatory barriers to implementation which are being addressed to some extent by the Federal Government and private non-profit organizations, but additional efforts are necessary.

### The Plan is key to Highway Sustainability

#### Only the federal government has the funds to solve

Transportation Research Board, 2001, “The Federal Role in Highway Research and Technology,” National Academies Press, http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record\_id=10222&page=101

The federal role in highway research and technology (R&T) is vital to highway innovation. Only the federal government has the resources to undertake and sustain high-risk—but potentially high-payoff—research, and only the federal government has the incentives to invest in long-term, fundamental research. In the committee’s judgment, the R&T program of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) is missing an opportunity to address this critical federal responsibility. This chapter presents recommendations for improving and strengthening the federal highway R&T program.

#### Even though some laws are currently in place, sustainability is not being achieved

John Bartle, Professor of Public Administration @ U of Nebraska, and Jijesh Devan, PhD Candidate, 2006, “Sustainable Highways: Destination or Mirage?,” Public Works Management and Policy, vol. 3, issue 10

Although substantial progress is being made toward developing administrative structures that support sustainability goals, the growing problems reviewed earlier indicate that the current structure of laws and agency powers still leaves highway transportation short of the goal of sustainable development.

#### Non-uniformity is limiting sustainability now

Federal Highway Administration, 2000, “Recycled Materials in European Highway Environments,” International Technology Exchange Program, http://international.fhwa.dot.gov/pdfs/recycolor.pdf

The private sector is developing innovations in materials processing and in new applications, particularly in appurtenances. Some states have beneficial use determination (BUD) processes to evaluate uses; however, there is no uniformity among states. State departments of transportation (DOTs) and state environmental protection agencies (State EPAs) are trying to balance the desire for increased use of recycled materials with concerns about potential environmental impacts.

### Green Highways are Key to Sustainability

#### Green highways use a range of sustainability measures

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 8-2008, “Developing Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure,” WISE, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2008/JamesBryceFinal.pdf

Green highways are a system of roads that mitigate the negative impact on the environment to a level past minimum standards. Green highways include more sustainable practices than modern construction techniques, and consist of maximizing the lifetime of a highway. Green highway construction techniques include; the use of recycled materials, ecosystem management, energy reduction, increasing the water quality of storm water runoff, and maximizing overall societal benefits.

#### Federal government action is key

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 8-2008, “Developing Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure,” WISE, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2008/JamesBryceFinal.pdf

Green classifications should be developed in order to determine the future needs for research and implementations of green highways. These classifications should be developed by a forum of experts, and will include regional and national highway needs. The classifications will vary from region to region, as the same technologies may not be required in every part of the United States. In order to promote the importance of sustainable construction, the classifications should be developed on a national scale and sponsored by the Federal Highway Administration. Currently there is no clearly defined role for the federal government in infrastructure issues, leading to a general lack of performance of federal programs. Federal programs need to take more charge in creating the initiative to build in a more sustainable and environmentally friendly conscious. Incentives need to be garnered and distributed to projects that recognize the needs of both the current and future generations.

#### We are landfilling most waste now

Federal Highway Administration, 2000, “Recycled Materials in European Highway Environments,” International Technology Exchange Program, http://international.fhwa.dot.gov/pdfs/recycolor.pdf

Waste-to-energy (WTE) is used as a major technology to recover energy from municipal solid waste (MSW), as landfilling is being phased out. The use of this technology is increasing in these European countries. In the United States, the use of this technology has decreased and the majority (60 percent) of our waste is landfilled. A large amount of landfilled material in the United States is either biodegradable or can be incinerated for energy recovery. Most of the countries would use the residues generated from this process.

### Sustainability is a Holistic Approach

#### Local builders need a federal green light

Sam Adams, Commissioner of Public Utilities, City of Portland, Oregon, 5-2007, “Green Transportation Infrastructure,” Congressional Testimony, http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/science/hsy34909.000/hsy34909\_0f.htm

The effort at green transportation infrastructure has really been in a research and development phase, a piloting phase, and that has been very necessary. What I hope happens is that we go from there to the strategies and the investment to make it as a way of doing business. In terms of local governments, what they really need to see from the federal regulators is very explicit green lights that this is not just okay to experiment with, but this is okay to begin to have as part of the way of doing business and managing the transportation system.

#### Sustainability looks at a large set of relevant issues

Ben Cotton, MA, community planner with the Transportation Planning Division at the Volpe National Transportation Systems Center in Cambridge, 2011, “In Pursuit of Sustainable Highways,” Federal Highway Administration, http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/publicroads/11novdec/03.cfm

In the transportation industry, projects and systems serve many different and sometimes competing objectives, including safety, mobility, environmental protection, livability, and asset management. A sustainable approach seeks to meet all of these needs while hitting economic targets for cost-effectiveness throughout a highway's life cycle.

#### New upgrades need a green approach

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 8-2008, “Developing Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure,” WISE, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2008/JamesBryceFinal.pdf

America’s infrastructure is currently strained to a state of limited functionality. Increased ridership and depleting funds have caused many state and federal departments of transportation to become concerned with the future of America’s roads. Much maintenance is required on highways, and their capacity is in desperate need of expansion. Infrastructure needs have been brought to the attention of Congress by GAO reports stating that, “The nation faces a host of serious infrastructure challenges. Demand has outpaced the capacity of our nation’s surface transportation …resulting in decreased performance and reliability.”

### Federal Expertise is Necessary

#### Federal expertise is key to teach and motivate non-federal actors

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 8-2008, “Developing Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure,” WISE, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2008/JamesBryceFinal.pdf

The Federal Highway Administration, in partnership with the Environmental Protection Agency, has the technical expertise and capacity to promote the use of green transportation infrastructure technologies by State and local governments and private industry through education and outreach and technical assistance programs.

#### Federal authority is key

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 8-2008, “Developing Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure,” WISE, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2008/JamesBryceFinal.pdf

Currently there is no clearly defined role for the federal government in infrastructure issues, leading to a general lack of involvement by federal programs. FHWA should assert more authority in the development of sustainable infrastructure, particularly in supporting the states departments of transportation in decision making. Sentiments at the FHWA are to stay clear of influencing the states to particular decisions. However, the move to sustainability must also change current practices. The FHWA has the ability to disperse information as well as educate states in adapting new best management practices. The spread of knowledge aligns with the role of the FHWA to being leaders in national mobility, stewards for national highway programs, and innovators for a better future.

#### Federal coordination is key

David Wu, JD @ Yale and former congressman, 5-2007, “Green Transportation Infrastructure,” Congressional Testimony, http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/science/hsy34909.000/hsy34909\_0f.htm

We also need to see better coordination among the federal agencies working on the R&D and regulatory aspects of green transportation infrastructure. Technology development must not happen in a vacuum. The DOT, EPA, universities, and other stakeholders must work together to make sure that technology fits into the current regulatory structure. Likewise, regulators must be flexible enough to evaluate technology according to its performance. In addition, the Federal Government should take the lead in training the private sector to insist on the use of green technologies for all new developments.

### A Centralized Approach at the Federal Level is Key

#### Centralization is key to develop best management practices

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 8-2008, “Developing Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure,” WISE, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2008/JamesBryceFinal.pdf

This section includes recommendations for green highway classification development, important aspects of green highways that should be supported, and potential changes in existing policy that would encourage green highway development. Recommendations are based on the facts collected in this research, as well as the concerns expressed by public officials on the issues. The recommendations are below, followed by descriptions of each. A single database containing all research pertinent to green highways needs to be developed and maintained by a mandated agency. More extensive lifecycle analysis research needs to be sponsored for green highways. The FHWA will need to have a stronger role in creating new best management practices to be adopted by individual states, as well as better supporting research.

#### Centralized data is vital

Gloria Shepherd, First witness of Congressional Testimony, Associate Administrator for Planning, Environment, and Realty at the Federal Highway Administration, 5-2007, “Green Transportation Infrastructure,” Congressional Testimony, http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/science/hsy34909.000/hsy34909\_0f.htm

Testing and evaluation should also cover the traditional criteria used to judge transportation infrastructure: safety, reliability, and cost. Currently, the EPA depends on outside groups for data collection, and as a result, data tends to be incomplete and only covers specific projects, not overall technology performance in a variety of settings. Because EPA uses performance-based standards to determine whether technologies effectively contribute to preventing water pollution, the lack of data makes it especially difficult to get approval to use new technology from some regional administrators.

#### Federal action is key on federal facilities and to create an incentive for sustainability across the board

Gloria Shepherd, First witness of Congressional Testimony, Associate Administrator for Planning, Environment, and Realty at the Federal Highway Administration, 5-2007, “Green Transportation Infrastructure,” Congressional Testimony, http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/science/hsy34909.000/hsy34909\_0f.htm

Federal agencies can also set a good example by using green infrastructure practices at their facilities around the country, thus demonstrating that these technologies are useful in many climates and settings around the country. There are also federal funding sources that could be used to provide incentives for the use of green infrastructure. In March, the House passed H.R. 720, the Water Quality Financing Act of 2007, which authorized the use of EPA grant money—which previously had been limited to funding traditional stormwater management infrastructure such as sewer pipes—for green infrastructure. Federal funding for green transportation infrastructure elements both provides a financial incentive for their use by states and municipalities and indicates federal recognition of the technology's effectiveness.

### Federal Action Promotes Multi-actor Solvency

#### A centralized federal database is key to developing sustainable practices

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 8-2008, “Developing Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure,” WISE, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2008/JamesBryceFinal.pdf

The development of green highways will require continued research and extensive dissemination of information. Research is being conducted around the country on many technologies and the information extends to design work. However, it is all too often that important research information is difficult to find or difficult to interpret. The success of a green highway program will hinge on the ability to gather and disperse information. An extensive database for research pertaining to green highways be developed and maintained by a federal program.

#### Federal action is key because there are currently federal regulations on use of green technology

Gloria Shepherd, First witness of Congressional Testimony, Associate Administrator for Planning, Environment, and Realty at the Federal Highway Administration, 5-2007, “Green Transportation Infrastructure,” Congressional Testimony, http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/science/hsy34909.000/hsy34909\_0f.htm

Additionally, better coordination between federal agencies is necessary to allow new technologies into the marketplace without being impeded by federal regulations. Currently, some EPA regions do not allow the use of innovative technologies in spite of work performed by other federal agencies, including FHWA, that demonstrates their effectiveness. Improving coordination between R&D agencies and regulatory agencies can help ensure that technology transfer is not hampered by outdated regulations.

#### Federal action is key because EPA regulations disincentivize sustainability

Gloria Shepherd, First witness of Congressional Testimony, Associate Administrator for Planning, Environment, and Realty at the Federal Highway Administration, 5-2007, “Green Transportation Infrastructure,” Congressional Testimony, http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/science/hsy34909.000/hsy34909\_0f.htm

However, though the Office of Water has been a strong advocate for green infrastructure projects, there are regulatory barriers internal to the EPA that prevent those projects from moving forward. Through the Clean Water Act, the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program gives EPA the authority to regulate sources of water that release pollutants into ground and surface water. The program is administered on a regional level, and regional administrators have discretion over defining a green infrastructure technology as a source of water that is covered by NPDES. If technologies such as pervious pavement or bio-swales, which filter runoff before it flows into the ground or surface water, are considered ''point sources'' that inject water directly into the ground. EPA regulations require permitting procedures that act as a significant disincentive to use these technologies.

### The Plan is Key to the US Economy

#### Green highways are key to rural economies

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 2008, “Exploring Green Highways,” Standardization News, http://www.astm.org/SNEWS/SO\_2008/bryce\_so08.html

For many years sustainability has been defined as a tool focused on the natural environment, and effects on the man-made environment have been overlooked. However, in a holistic approach to sustainable construction, overall societal benefits should be taken into account. Highways have an important impact on local economies. An aesthetically appealing highway design can draw business into a community and supply local jobs and tax income, whereas a poorly designed highway can decrease traffic to a business and eventually cause the business to seek a better location.

#### The plan jumpstarts competitiveness

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 8-2008, “Developing Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure,” WISE, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2008/JamesBryceFinal.pdf

The spread of knowledge aligns with the role of the FHWA to being leaders in national mobility, stewards for national highway programs, and innovators for a better future. Research should be funded at a higher rate, as well as advocated more extensively by the FHWA. In addition to developing beneficial technologies, research funds the higher education of many science and technology students to become future experts in their fields. Information gathered from research projects benefit society, and research results have important roles in decision making. In a recent Transportation Research Board magazine article, the results from an Indiana DOT research project produced costs savings of over $150,000 in one month. Research is the catalyst to technology development, and has been recognized as important for the continued growth of the United States. The ability of the United States to remain competitive in the global economy relies on the United States’ research and development of innovative technologies. However, the authorization of SAFETEA-LU directed that less than two percent of funds be spent on title V research. Many more modes for funding research should be developed and distributed.

#### Sustainable highways are key to the economy

Hal Kassoff, Former State Highway Administrator in the State of Maryland, 5-2007, “Green Transportation Infrastructure,” Congressional Testimony, http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/science/hsy34909.000/hsy34909\_0f.htm

A fourth factor is that sustainable highways makes good business and good economic sense from several perspectives. On a project level, they contribute to economic efficiency, since context sensitive and sustainable highway improvements are more likely to be supported and implemented much faster than less contextual and less sustainable alternatives, which are more likely to languish. Also, from a life cycle asset management perspective, investing in increased durability and preventive maintenance means lower life cycle costs, less consumption of nonrenewable resources, and reduced economic losses to shippers and travels, who are delayed less frequently by repairs and reconstruction.

### The Plan Solves Economic Growth

#### The plan produces long-term economic savings

Gloria Shepherd, First witness of Congressional Testimony, Associate Administrator for Planning, Environment, and Realty at the Federal Highway Administration, 5-2007, “Green Transportation Infrastructure,” Congressional Testimony, http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/science/hsy34909.000/hsy34909\_0f.htm

When appropriately applied, ''green'' transportation technologies and practices, such as use of highway infrastructure to mitigate stormwater runoff, beneficial re-use of industrial byproduct materials, and context sensitive solutions, not only yield significant benefits for avoiding or mitigating negative environmental impacts of highway construction, but can produce safety enhancements and economic savings as well. Ongoing research, transfer of technologies and best practices, and new partnerships are providing states and tribal governments more knowledge and tools to address such issues as stormwater runoff control. A heightened focus on integrated planning should help ensure that potential environmental impacts are identified and addressed early in the project development process.

#### The plan is cheaper than alternatives

Gearlog, environment staff, 11-2-2010, “Beyond Asphalt, Creating Green Highways From Sand and Microbes,” http://www.geek.com/articles/gadgets/beyond-asphalt-creating-green-highways-from-sand-and-microbes-2010112/

That’s why engineers are starting to look to alternatives to asphalt in road construction. One pair of designers has created a new project that hopes to do just that. The research team of Thomas Kosbau and Andrew Wetzler recently won the Korean green design Iida Awards 2010 for their innovative road construction: “Sand.Stone.Road.” The idea is simple: using very cheap and abundant sand, and mix it with a common microbe to create roadworthy sandstone. If implemented, the idea would not only take a need for millions of barrels of oil out of the global equation, but save money. The system would be far cheaper than traditional asphalt, which rose in price by 222% (!) between 2003 and 2008.

#### Spending now solves long-term debt

John Judis, senior editor at The New Republic and a visiting fellow at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 11-25-2009, “The Case for Deficit Spending,” The New Republic, http://www.tnr.com/article/politics/the-case-deficit-spending?page=0,1

Won’t greater deficits lead to greater debt, which will burden our grandchildren with intolerable obligations? They will in the short term, but they are also the only way to avoid even higher debt in the longer term. The current deficits are much more the result of lost revenues than of increased spending--and they will begin to diminish only when revenues (wages and profits) begin to rise again. That won’t happen without deficit spending now.

### The Economy Risks Collapse Now

#### Qualified experts agree a recession is coming now

Chris Isidore, Money analyst @ CNN, 2-24-2012, “A new recession seems inevitable,” CNN Money, http://money.cnn.com/2012/02/24/news/economy/double\_dip\_recession/index.htm

ECRI is one of the more widely respected firms on economic recessions, as it has never been wrong when forecasting that a recession would start, or failed to predict a recession well before it was widely accepted. Achuthan predicts the recession will happen even without a new shock to the economy, such as a spike in oil and gas prices or a Greek sovereign debt default sparking a financial meltdown.

#### This prediction is not hyperbole

Chris Isidore, Money analyst @ CNN, 2-24-2012, “A new recession seems inevitable,” CNN Money, http://money.cnn.com/2012/02/24/news/economy/double\_dip\_recession/index.htm

Achuthan denies that he is taking a bearish view of the economy, saying that when others worried about a double-dip recession risk in the fall of 2010, he saw no signs of a downturn at that time. But more than 50 years of economic data followed by his firm has shown him that when underlying growth slows to this degree, a recession always follows.

#### Any growth will be slow and risk collapse

Ed Lazear 4-2, Professor @ Stanford’s Graduate School of Business, 4-2-2012, “The Worst Economic Recovery in History,” Wall Street Journal, p. A3

How many times have we heard that this was the worst recession since the Great Depression? That may be true—although the double-dip recession of the early 1980s was about comparable. Less publicized is that our current recovery pales in comparison with most other recoveries, including the one following the Great Depression. The Great Depression started with major economic contractions in 1930, '31, '32 and '33. In the three following years, the economy rebounded strongly with growth rates of 11%, 9% and 13%, respectively. The current recovery began in the second half of 2009, but economic growth has been weak. Growth in 2010 was 3% and in 2011 it was 1.7%. Who knows what 2012 will bring, but the current growth rate looks to be about 2%, according to the consensus of economists recently polled by Blue Chip Economic Indicators. Sadly, we have never really recovered from the recession. The economy has not even returned to its long-term growth rate and is certainly not making up for lost ground. No doubt, there are favorable economic numbers to be found, but overall we continue to struggle.

### New Spending is Key to the Economy

#### New spending is key to avert recession

Mohamed El-Arian, CEO and co-CIO of PIMCO, 11-1-2011,“Could America turn out worse than Japan?,” Money Web, http://www.moneyweb.co.za/mw/view/mw/en/page292681?oid=555164&sn=2009+Detail

They must also realize that the country has fewer financial and societal cushions to deal with this risk should it materialize. The sooner that happens, the greater the chance America can use its still-considerable strengths to overcome its policy paralysis and embark on much needed – and much discussed – measures to remove structural and debt impediments to job creation and to higher and more inclusive, economic growth. Against this background, it is encouraging to see the Administration recently propose a number of steps that, assuming congressional cooperation, would serve as a foundation for further progress. This is especially true for the jobs proposal, and also for the reforms to housing. But much more needs to be done to urgently improve the key enablers of sustained expansion: namely, the functioning of the housing and labor market, the process of credit intermediation, productivity-enhancing infrastructure, and balancing immediate fiscal stimulus with medium-term reform of both the revenue and spending side.

#### There is limited flexibility to achieve any other solution

Mohamed El-Arian, CEO and co-CIO of PIMCO, 11-1-2011,“Could America turn out worse than Japan?,” Money Web, http://www.moneyweb.co.za/mw/view/mw/en/page292681?oid=555164&sn=2009+Detail

As a result, the economy faces a risk of tipping into another recession. A recession at this time would be terrifying – from an economic, social, political and institutional perspective. In addition to the country’s unemployment crisis, almost a quarter of homeowners owe more in mortgage debt than the value of their houses. With policy interest rates floored at 0% for quite a while now and the fiscal deficit hovering at almost 9% of GDP there is limited policy flexibility.

#### New public projects are key

Bonnie Kavoussi, “U.S. Economy Needs More Federal Spending, Yale Economists Say,” 10-14-2011, Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/mobileweb/2011/10/14/federal-spending-stimulus-yale-economists-recommend\_n\_1011097.html

As Yale University economists gathered on Thursday evening to discuss job growth strategies, many warned that a failure to act aggressively risks the increasing possibility of many years of economic stagnation, elevated joblessness and declining living standards. Some suggested that the government must act quickly to put millions of Americans back to work with large-scale public projects, while warning that an inadequate response risks a U.S. fate similar to Japan's so-called lost decade.

### The Manufacturing Industry is Important

#### Manufacturing is key to the economy

Franklin Vargo, President @ National Association of Manufacturers, 10-1-2003, “Hearing On China’s Exchange Rate Regime and Its Effects on the U.S. Economy,” Federal News Service, p. A2

I would like to begin my statement with a review of why manufacturing is vital to the U.S. economy. Since manufacturing only represents about 16 percent of the nation's output, who cares? Isn't the United States a post-manufacturing services economy? Who needs manufacturing? The answer in brief is that the United States economy would collapse without manufacturing, as would our national security and our role in the world. That is because manufacturing is really the foundation of our economy, both in terms of innovation and production and in terms of supporting the rest of the economy.

#### Manufacturing has spillover benefits that benefit the whole economy

Franklin Vargo, President @ National Association of Manufacturers, 10-1-2003, “Hearing On China’s Exchange Rate Regime and Its Effects on the U.S. Economy,” Federal News Service, p. A2

For example, many individuals point out that only about 3 percent of the U.S. workforce is on the farm, but they manage to feed the nation and export to the rest of the world. But how did this agricultural productivity come to be? It is because of the tractors and combines and satellite systems and fertilizers and advanced seeds, etc. that came from the genius and productivity of the manufacturing sector. Similarly, in services -- can you envision an airline without airplanes? Fast food outlets without griddles and freezers? Insurance companies or banks without computers? Certainly not. The manufacturing industry is truly the innovation industry, without which the rest of the economy could not prosper. Manufacturing performs over 60 percent of the nation's research and development. Additionally, it also underlies the technological ability of the United States to maintain its national security and its global leadership.

#### Manufacturing is key to overall economic productivity

Franklin Vargo, President @ National Association of Manufacturers, 10-1-2003, “Hearing On China’s Exchange Rate Regime and Its Effects on the U.S. Economy,” Federal News Service, p. A2

Manufacturing makes a disproportionately large contribution to productivity, more than twice the rate of the overall economy, and pays wages that are about 20 percent higher than in other sectors. But its most fundamental importance lies in the fact that a healthy manufacturing sector truly underlies the entire U.S. standard of living -because it is the principal way by which the United States pays its way in the world. Manufacturing accounts for over 80 percent of all U.S. exports of goods. America's farmers will export somewhat over $50 billion this year, but America's manufacturers export almost that much event month! Even when services are included, manufacturing accounts for two-thirds of all U.S. exports of goods and services. If the U.S. manufacturing sector were to become seriously impaired, what combination of farm products together with architectural, travel, insurance, engineering and other services could make up for the missing two-thirds of our exports represented by manufactures? The answer is "none."

### Economic Collapse Breeds Conflict

#### Economic collapse causes nuclear war

Richard Cook, Frequent contributor to Global Research, 6-14-2007, “It’s Official: The Crash of the U.S. Economy has begun,” Global Research, http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=5964

Times of economic crisis produce international tension and politicians tend to go to war rather than face the economic music. The classic example is the worldwide depression of the 1930s leading to World War II. Conditions in the coming years could be as bad as they were then. We could have a really big war if the U.S. decides once and for all to haul off and let China, or whomever, have it in the chops. If they don’t want our dollars or our debt any more, how about a few nukes?

#### Collapse causes global wars

Bernado v. Lopez, Communications Consultant and Staff Writer at Business World, 9-10-1998, “Editorial,” Business World, pg. 12

What would it be like if global recession becomes full bloom? The results will be catastrophic. Certainly, global recession will spawn wars of all kinds. Ethnic wars can easily escalate in the grapple for dwindling food stocks as in India-Pakistan-Afghanistan, Yugoslavia, Ethiopia-Eritrea, Indonesia. Regional conflicts in key flashpoints can easily erupt such as in the Middle East, Korea, and Taiwan.

#### Even small conflicts escalate

Michael Klare, professor of peace and world security studies at Hampshire College, 2-26-2009, “A Planet at the Brink?,” Asia Times, http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Global\_Economy/KB26Dj02.html

Combine these two World Bank findings - zero economic growth in the developing world and rising food prices - and you have a perfect recipe for unrelenting civil unrest and violence. The eruptions seen in 2008 and early 2009 will then be mere harbingers of a grim future in which, in a given week, any number of cities reel from riots and civil disturbances which could spread like multiple brushfires in a drought.

### Economic Collapse Hurts the Environment

#### Economic growth solves population growth

Jack Hollander, professor emeritus of Energy and Resources at the University of California, 5-29-2003, “No Region Left Behind,” Oakland Tribune, p. 3

The picture is very different in the developing countries. Poverty itself is the environmental villain, and poor people are its victims. One example is the population problem. An absolute requirement for a future sustainable environment is a stable global population, yet traditionally the poorest countries produced explosive population- growth rates. The large families in these countries were the result of high expected death rates from hunger, infectious diseases, contaminated water, lack of health care, resources and education. Now, as income slowly rises in the developing countries, one can see the beginnings of a trend toward population stability. In every country with per-capita annual income over $5,000 (1994 dollars), the fertility rate (average number of children per woman) has dropped to the point where it is not higher than, and in some cases lower than, the minimum replacement level (2.1 children per woman). Even in Sri Lanka, where per-capita income is under $1,000, the fertility rate is only at replacement level.

#### Overpopulation devastates the environment

Edward Otten, Professor of Emergency Medicine and Pediatrics at the University of Cincinnati, 2001, “Human Population Growth,” Ecology, http://www.ecology.org/biod/population/human\_pop1.html

The exponential growth of the human population, making humans the dominant species on the planet, is having a grave impact on biodiversity. This destruction of species by humans will eventually lead to a destruction of the human species through natural selection. While human beings have had an effect for the last 50,000 years, it has only been since the industrial revolution that the impact has been global rather than regional. This global impact is taking place through five primary processes: over harvesting, alien species introduction, pollution, habitat fragmentation, and outright habit destruction.

#### Economic decline destroys rainforests

John Levine, Staff @ World Socialist Website, “Brazil: profit and poverty fuel Amazon deforestation,” 1-2005, World Socialist Website, http://www.wsws.org/articles/2005/jan2005/amaz-j15.shtml

This growing environmental disaster is the product of the desperate poverty of Brazil’s farmers, the irrationality of isolationist national development, and the destruction wreaked by global markets dominated by multinational corporations. Without an internationally coordinated management of forests and wildlife, along with a guarantee of a livable wage to all people, no country can maintain threatened ecosystems. Deforestation poses many unknown risks to the environment, and reduces biodiversity, immeasurably limiting scientific discovery. Humanity has removed about 78 percent of primary forest coverage. Among tropical forests, an estimated 55 percent remains. Pennsylvania State University professor of environmental sciences James Alcock, predicts that if deforestation continues unabated, within 10 to 15 years it will reach a “point of no return,” and the entire Amazon rain forest could be wiped out within 40 or 50 years. The Amazon’s destruction would spell drastic changes in the global environment.

### The Plan is key to Environmental Sustainability

#### Green highways are key to environmental sustainability

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 2008, “Exploring Green Highways,” Standardization News, http://www.astm.org/SNEWS/SO\_2008/bryce\_so08.html

The development of green highways will play an important role in the effort to mitigate man-made impacts on the natural environment. The market for green construction is being explored and expanded. Many disciplines have realized the benefits of sustainability. Green construction has taken place in the structures market and has had positive results with the development of green building rating systems. However, success in private markets does not automatically translate into success in the public sector. Highways are publicly owned and funded, and new innovative techniques must be developed for sustainable highways. The U.S. has consistently been at the forefront of technological advancement and has traditionally placed emphasis on the need for integrated infrastructure and efficient, low-cost construction. However, with the fear of man’s increasingly irreversible impact on the natural environment, new infrastructure goals need to be recognized.

#### Poorly designed highways devastate the environment

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 8-2008, “Developing Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure,” WISE, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2008/JamesBryceFinal.pdf

Green highway development includes designing highways in such a manner that improves the quality of the nation’s infrastructure. For instance, lifecycle energy reduction sets a standard that the highway will have a long-term life that will accommodate traffic flows with minimal congestion. Designing a highway in such a manner not only reduces the cost of energy and maintenance, but also increases the capacity of the highway and reduces emissions caused by vehicles stuck in congestion.

#### The plan is key to a sustainable drinking water supply

Benjamin Grumbles, former EPA administrator, former professor of law @ GWU, President of the Clean Water America Alliance, 5-2007, “Green Transportation Infrastructure,” Congressional Testimony, http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/science/hsy34909.000/hsy34909\_0f.htm

Moreover, green infrastructure can play a critical role in the broader context of sustainable infrastructure by being integrated into comprehensive plans that simultaneously address communities' drinking water supply, wastewater management, stormwater management and recreational needs. The use of green infrastructure can help communities meet their overall water resource management goals and reduce the costs (or free up funding for other uses such as land purchases) of constructing and maintaining engineered infrastructure including pipes and treatment systems.

### The Plan Solves Drinking Water

#### The plan mitigates water pollution

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 8-2008, “Developing Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure,” WISE, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2008/JamesBryceFinal.pdf

H.R. 5161 outlined research areas needed in the field of green highways. The findings of the bill are as follows; (1) Transportation infrastructure contributes to the pollution of surface and ground water because it is comprised of impervious surfaces that concentrate contaminants which are introduced into the water supply during storms. (2) Scientists and engineers have developed numerous technologies that can be incorporated into transportation infrastructure which control storm water and mitigate nonpoint source water pollution.

#### Poorly constructed highways devastate water supplies

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 8-2008, “Developing Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure,” WISE, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2008/JamesBryceFinal.pdf

Watershed driven storm water management is significant in reducing the storm water runoff from a highway, as well as treating the runoff. Storm water management consists of various techniques for containing and treating the runoff produced by a highway, as well as diverting the storm water runoff to areas where it can infiltrate through to the groundwater table. In a book titled Porous Pavements, Bruce Ferguson explains effects of surface runoff due to impervious pavements. “… impervious pavements produce two-thirds of the excess runoff…are responsible for essentially all of the hydrocarbon pollutants…produce two-thirds of the groundwater decline and resulting local water shortages.

#### The plan prevents dirty runoff

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 8-2008, “Developing Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure,” WISE, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2008/JamesBryceFinal.pdf

In a testimony given before Congress, the Assistant Administrator for Water at the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), Benjamin H. Grumbles, explained ways that green highways could improve water quality. “Green infrastructure practices protect water quality primarily in two ways. First, they reduce the amount of pollutants that run off a site and ultimately are discharged into adjacent water bodies. Secondly, they reduce or eliminate the water that runs off the site.”

### The Plan Solves Air Pollution

#### Sustainable practices reduce air pollution

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 8-2008, “Developing Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure,” WISE, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2008/JamesBryceFinal.pdf

Energy is an important economic concern, and the construction a highway requires a large amount of energy. A significant amount of energy is used to produce both asphalt and cement for use in pavements and excavating materials for use in the road base. Energy is required during maintenance of a road, and energy is consumed by vehicles traveling in congestion on a poorly designed highway. Practices exist to reduce the lifecycle energy consumption of a highway. Many of these practices also work to reduce emissions, leading to better air quality. For instance, the US Department of Transportation’s (DOT) research center, RITA (Research and Innovative Technology Administration), is developing a method of using warm mix asphalt in place of hot mix asphalt.

#### The plan solves construction and driving emissions

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 8-2008, “Developing Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure,” WISE, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2008/JamesBryceFinal.pdf

Technologies are also being researched to integrate traffic flow data with the infrastructure for route optimization and congestion mitigation, consequently reducing energy consumption and emissions. Overall, transportation practices account for more than 25 percent of total green house gas emissions. Energy and emissions can both be reduced during highway construction. Many companies have policies that prohibit a truck on a jobsite to be left idling.

#### Changes in volume devastate the environment

Gloria Shepherd, First witness of Congressional Testimony, Associate Administrator for Planning, Environment, and Realty at the Federal Highway Administration, 5-2007, “Green Transportation Infrastructure,” Congressional Testimony, http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/science/hsy34909.000/hsy34909\_0f.htm

These changes in volume and timing can degrade the physical characteristics of streams and rivers. Increases in erosion will widen channels, decrease the stability of banks, and widen flood plains. These changes affect the fish and other animals and plants. Additionally, these changes to the watershed can increase the possibility that a stream will experience reduced or intermittent flow during some times of the year, since there is less groundwater to recharge the stream and the flow of runoff into the stream is no longer gradual but instead very sharp. Thus, developed areas have a significant and far-ranging environmental impact.

### The Plan Solves Non-Point Pollution

#### The plan solves non-point water pollution

Gloria Shepherd, First witness of Congressional Testimony, Associate Administrator for Planning, Environment, and Realty at the Federal Highway Administration, 5-2007, “Green Transportation Infrastructure,” Congressional Testimony, http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/science/hsy34909.000/hsy34909\_0f.htm

Runoff from highways contributes to non-point source pollution—the type of non-localized pollution emission that is responsible for over 80 percent of the degradation of the Nation's surface water. Stormwater moves over agricultural land, lawns, urban areas, and other types of human land-use, washing chemicals like fertilizers, heavy metals, and harmful bacteria into surface water. Highway and other transportation installations are major contributors to this type of pollution.

#### Impervious roads lead to widespread water problems

Gloria Shepherd, First witness of Congressional Testimony, Associate Administrator for Planning, Environment, and Realty at the Federal Highway Administration, 5-2007, “Green Transportation Infrastructure,” Congressional Testimony, http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/science/hsy34909.000/hsy34909\_0f.htm

Changes in the amount of land covered by surfaces that are impervious to water, such as roads or parking lots, can have significant impacts on an area's natural hydrology, potentially resulting in flooding, pollution, or aquatic ecosystem destruction. Due to their impermeable nature, roads and parking lots decrease the amount of rainwater that will infiltrate into the ground, leading to an increase in the amount of rainwater that runs over the surface of the ground, referred to as ''surface runoff.'' An area that is fully paved has on average of 15 to 20 times the amount of runoff as a completely undeveloped area. Thus, streams, rivers, lakes and other bodies of surface water receive a greater volume of runoff under developed conditions than they would under undeveloped conditions. They also receive the peak flow of this surface runoff much sooner than they would under natural conditions, where water would filter through slowly.

#### The plan solves 97 percent of wildlife loss

James Bryce, BA in Civil Engineering and ASTM-sponsored participant in the Washington Internships for Students of Engineering program, 8-2008, “Developing Sustainable Transportation Infrastructure,” WISE, http://www.wise-intern.org/journal/2008/JamesBryceFinal.pdf

Other adverse wildlife effects can be seen when natural flows increase in streams and rivers near a highway. The excess flow is caused by surface runoff from the highways and can cause scouring of the river bed, resulting in the widening of the stream channel. The widening of the channel, along with the lowering of the natural ground water table due to more impervious areas created by highways, can cause times of very low-flow and even no-flow in streams. Times of no flow in streams are often detrimental to local habitats. Ecosystem management can include the use of wildlife crossings, and wildlife buffer zones. According to a study presented to the Transportation Research Board, providing animal crossing structures and underpasses reduced the vehicle-wildlife collisions as much as ninetyseven percent.

### Biodiversity is Important for Life on Earth

#### Environmental decline leads to war

Thomas Homer-Dixon, assistant professor of political science and director of the Peace and Conflict Studies Programme at the University of Toronto, 1998, “World Security Challenges for a New Century,” p. 342-343

Environmental change could in time cause a slow deepening of poverty in poor countries, which might open bitter divisions between classes and ethnic groups, corrode democratic institutions, and spawn revolutions and insurgencies. In general, many experts have the sense that environmental problems will “ratchet up” the level of stress within states and the international community, increasing the likelihood of many different kinds of conflict—from war and rebellion to trade disputes—and undermining possibilities for cooperation.

#### Each species extinction risks all of humanity

David Diner, Major and JAG Corps in US Army, 1994, “The Army and the Endangered Species Act,” 1994, Military Law Review, p. 164

Biologically diverse ecosystems are characterized by a large number of specialist species, filling narrow ecological niches. These ecosystems inherently are more stable than less diverse systems. "The more complex the ecosystem, the more successfully it can resist a stress. . . . [l]ike a net, in which each knot is connected to others by several strands, such a fabric can resist collapse better than a simple, unbranched circle of threads -- which if cut anywhere breaks down as a whole." By causing widespread extinctions, humans have artificially simplified many ecosystems. As biologic simplicity increases, so does the risk of ecosystem failure. The spreading Sahara Desert in Africa, and the dustbowl conditions of the 1930s in the United States are relatively mild examples of what might be expected if this trend continues. Theoretically, each new animal or plant extinction, with all its dimly perceived and intertwined affects, could cause total ecosystem collapse and human extinction. Each new extinction increases the risk of disaster. Like a mechanic removing, one by one, the rivets from an aircraft's wings, [hu]mankind may be edging closer to the abyss.

#### Species extinction risks all of humanity

Jerry Coyne, Professor in the Department of Ecology and Evolution at the University of Chicago, and, Hopi Hoekstra, Associate Professor in the Department of Organismic and Evolutionary Biology at Harvard University, 9-24-2007, “The Greatest Dying,” The New Republic, http://www.truthout.org/article/jerry-coyne-and-hopi-e-hoekstra-the-greatestdying

Species extinction is also imperiling coral reefs - a major problem since these reefs have far more than recreational value: They provide tremendous amounts of food for human populations and buffer coastlines against erosion. In fact, the global value of "hidden" services provided by ecosystems - those services, like waste disposal, that aren't bought and sold in the marketplace - has been estimated to be as much as $50 trillion per year, roughly equal to the gross domestic product of all countries combined. And that doesn't include tangible goods like fish and timber. Life as we know it would be impossible if ecosystems collapsed.

### Global Temperatures are Increasing

#### Global temperatures are increasing

Richard Somerville, Distinguished Professor Emeritus and Research Professor at Scripps Institution of Oceanography at the University of California, San Diego, 3-8-2011, “Climate Science and EPA’s Greenhouse Gas Regulations,” CQ Congressional Testimony, p. 785

In early 2007, at the time of the publication of WG1 of AR4, the mainstream global community of climate scientists already understood from the most recent research that the latest observations of climate change were disquieting. In the words of a research paper published at the same time as the release of AR4 WG1, a paper for which I am a co-author, "observational data underscore the concerns about global climate change. Previous projections, as summarized by IPCC, have not exaggerated but may in some respects even have underestimated the change" (Rahmstorf et al. 2007). Now, in 2011, more recent research and newer observations have demonstrated that climate change continues to occur, and in several aspects the magnitude and rapidity of observed changes frequently exceed the estimates of earlier projections, including those of AR4.

#### Human influence on the environment is increasing

Richard Somerville, Distinguished Professor Emeritus and Research Professor at Scripps Institution of Oceanography at the University of California, San Diego, 3-8-2011, “Climate Science and EPA’s Greenhouse Gas Regulations,” CQ Congressional Testimony, p. 785

In addition, the case for attributing much observed recent climate change to human activities is even stronger now than at the time of AR4. Several recent examples, drawn from many aspects of climate science, but especially emphasizing atmospheric phenomena, support this conclusion. These include temperature, atmospheric moisture content, precipitation, and other aspects of the hydrological cycle. Motivated by the rapid progress in research, a recent scientific synthesis, The Copenhagen Diagnosis (Allison et al. 2009), has assessed recent climate research findings, including: -- Measurements show that the Greenland and Antarctic ice-sheets are losing mass and contributing to sea level rise. -- Arctic sea-ice has melted far beyond the expectations of climate models. -- Global sea level rise may attain or exceed 1 meter by 2100, with a rise of up to 2 meters considered possible.

#### Emissions cuts are necessary

Richard Somerville, Distinguished Professor Emeritus and Research Professor at Scripps Institution of Oceanography at the University of California, San Diego, 3-8-2011, “Climate Science and EPA’s Greenhouse Gas Regulations,” CQ Congressional Testimony, p. 786

This is a much- discussed goal for a maximum allowable degree of climate change, and this aspirational target has now been formally adopted by the European Union and is supported by many other countries, as expressed, for example, in statements by both the G-8 and G-20 groups of nations. The Copenhagen Diagnosis also cites research supporting the position that, in order to have a reasonable likelihood of avoiding the risk of dangerous climate disruption, defined by this 2 degree Celsius (or 3.6 degree Fahrenheit) limit, global emissions of greenhouse gases such as carbon dioxide must peak and then start to decline rapidly within the next five to ten years, reaching near zero well within this century.

### Global Warming is Anthropogenic

#### Carbon emissions lead to blobal warming

Francis Zweirs, Professor of Math and Statistics, Chief of the Canadian Centre for Climate Modelling and Analysis, Atmospheric Environment Service, Victoria, 3-8-2011, “Climate Science and EPA’s Greenhouse Gas Regulations,” CQ Congressional Testimony, p. 824

Human use of fossil fuels and the land surface have lead to an increase in the atmospheric concentration of CO2 from about 280 ppmv prior to industrialization to approximately 390 ppmv today (GAW, 2010). Concentrations continue to rise at a rate of about 2 ppmv per year. CO2 is a gas that is transparent to sunlight, and thus its presence in the atmosphere does not impede the flow of energy into the Earth system. Sunlight, which powers the Earth system, is either reflected back to space (by clouds, reflective aerosols, or the Earth's surface), or absorbed and converted to heat. In order to maintain a constant temperature, the Earth must, in turn, radiate the heat that is produced from sunlight back to space.

#### The greenhouse effect is scientifically proven

Francis Zweirs, Professor of Math and Statistics, Chief of the Canadian Centre for Climate Modelling and Analysis, Atmospheric Environment Service, Victoria, 3-8-2011, “Climate Science and EPA’s Greenhouse Gas Regulations,” CQ Congressional Testimony, p. 824

However, higher levels of CO2 and other greenhouse gases in the atmospheric make it more difficult for heat to exit the system because these gases not fully transparent to infrared (heat) radiation. This inevitably leads to a warming, the magnitude of which depends upon various "feedback" processes. Science has been aware of this warming effect, which is now well evident in observations, since the 19th century (Fourier, 1824; Arrhenius, 1896; Harries et al., 2001).

#### Longitudinal historical analysis proves

James Hansen, director of NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies and professor in the Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences @ Columbia University, 2009, “Storms of my Grandchildren: The Truth About the Coming Climate Catastrophe and our Last Chance to Save Humanity” pg. 9

Carbon dioxide increased from 280 parts per million (ppm; thus 0.028 percent atmospheric molecules) in 1750 to 370 ppm in 2000 (and to 287 ppm in 2009). The impact of this Co2 change on Earth’s radiation balance can be calculated accurately, with an uncertainty of less than 15 percent. The climate forcing due to the 1750-2000 CO2 increase is about 1.5 watts. Other human-caused changes, such as adding methane, nitrous oxygen, chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), and ozone to the atmosphere, make the total greenhouse gas forcing about 3 watts.

### The Technology for the Plan is Proven

#### The technology has been proven

Elizabeth Nanas, PhD Candidate @ Wayne State, and Tani Bellestri, copyeditor in Detroit, 2011, “Highways,” SAGE Reference Series on Green Society, http://enanas.files.wordpress.com/2011/06/highways\_nanasbellestri\_finaldraft.pdf

Some of the measures being implemented in relation to the project include evaluation of overall resource conditions and consultation with project partners and public stakeholders, all in effort to balance and minimize negative consequences on both the natural and built environments. Participants believe that the Waldorf project has the potential to serve as a model for other green highway projects across the United States.

#### Biocells have been used elsewhere to prevent loss of drinking water

Elizabeth Nanas, PhD Candidate @ Wayne State, and Tani Bellestri, copyeditor in Detroit, 2011, “Highways,” SAGE Reference Series on Green Society, http://enanas.files.wordpress.com/2011/06/highways\_nanasbellestri\_finaldraft.pdf

Stormwater management is one of the major focuses of green highway construction. An example of the innovative stormwater management methods being embraced in green highway initiatives includes the use of biocells, like the one installed in Washington, DC, in 2004, by the District DOT. A biocell is composed of natural materials such as mulch, soil mix, and various types of vegetation. As opposed to drainage pits, a biocell actually performs like a filtration device and can remove up to 90 percent of the suspended solids from stormwater. Using permeable materials to construct highways and their support structures will help keep metals and toxins from leaching into rivers and streams.

#### Use of recycled materials is widely proven

Elizabeth Nanas, PhD Candidate @ Wayne State, and Tani Bellestri, copyeditor in Detroit, 2011, “Highways,” SAGE Reference Series on Green Society, http://enanas.files.wordpress.com/2011/06/highways\_nanasbellestri\_finaldraft.pdf

Recycling and reuse of materials is another major component of green highway strategies. Successful examples of recycling and reuse include the Pennsylvania DOT’s use of shredded tires as lightweight embankment fill in the construction of the Tarrtown Bridge, and the West Virginia DOT’s use of recycled blast furnace slag for much of its asphalt surface pavements. The blast furnace slag offers a number of benefits, including providing safer driving conditions due to its nonpolishing properties—the roadway does not experience as much spray or misting during rain, providing better visibility and less hydroplaning.

### The Plan Prevents Landfilling

#### Incorporation of recycled projects prevents waste

Tuncer Edil, Professor of Civil Engineering @ Wisconsin, 10-2006, “Green Highways: Strategy for Recycling Materials for Sustainable Construction Practices,” International Congress on Advances in Civil Engineering, p. 1

Transportation facilities, such as highways, in particular use large quantities of materials in initial construction and also during periodic rehabilitation. Recycling industrial by-products and construction materials in highway construction can help generate “green highways” where use of virgin materials and large amounts of energy is avoided. The necessary steps for deliberate societal transition to widespread use of recycled materials in highway construction is presented and discussed through examples of several such materials. Specifically, use of coal combustion by-products, foundry by-products, recycled pavement materials, and scrapped automobile tires in highway construction are presented.

#### This solves landfilling

Tuncer Edil, Professor of Civil Engineering @ Wisconsin, 10-2006, “Green Highways: Strategy for Recycling Materials for Sustainable Construction Practices,” International Congress on Advances in Civil Engineering, p. 3

World industries annually generate millions of metric tons of solid by-products (Miller and Collins 1976). Most of these materials have been landfilled in the developed countries at considerable cost since the inception of modern environmental regulations in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Recently there has been a shift in societal attitudes resulting in strong interest in developing beneficial reuse markets for industrial byproducts.

#### Failure to incorporate sustainability into highway planning leads to large amounts of new waste

Tuncer Edil, Professor of Civil Engineering @ Wisconsin, 10-2006, “Green Highways: Strategy for Recycling Materials for Sustainable Construction Practices,” International Congress on Advances in Civil Engineering, p. 4

Green highways concept aims at encouraging and accelerating the wide spread use of recycled materials. In fact, blast furnace slag, fly ash, bottom ash, boiler slag, reclaimed pavement materials, anthratic coal waste, and many other industrial by-products have been or are in the process of being beneficially used as highway construction materials (Miller and Collins, 1976). The transportation, construction, and environmental industries have the greatest potential for reuse because they use vast quantities of earthen materials annually.

#### A transition is inevitable, but we should start it now

Sam Adams, Commissioner of Public Utilities, City of Portland, Oregon, 5-2007, “Green Transportation Infrastructure,” Congressional Testimony, http://commdocs.house.gov/committees/science/hsy34909.000/hsy34909\_0f.htm

A transition from traditional to green technologies is unavoidable. We must hasten the change by expanding our definition of technology and infrastructure to integrate built and natural environments. Green technologies marry together science, engineering and design to construct green infrastructure that is seamless, sustainable and cost effective.

### The States Counterplan Fails

#### States are facing budget crises now

Elizabeth McNichol, M.A. in Political Science from the University of Chicago, 5-24-2012, “States Continue to Feel Recession’s Impact,” Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, http://www.cbpp.org/cms/index.cfm?fa=view&id=711

State budget estimates for the upcoming fiscal year continue to show that states face a long and uncertain recovery. For fiscal year 2013, the fiscal year that begins July 1, 2012, 30 states have addressed or have projected shortfalls totaling $54 billion.

#### Federal funding is key because of the lack of state dollars

Elizabeth McNichol, M.A. in Political Science from the University of Chicago, 5-24-2012, “States Continue to Feel Recession’s Impact,” Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, http://www.cbpp.org/cms/index.cfm?fa=view&id=711

The additional cuts mean that state budgets are poised to continue to be a drag on the national economy, threatening hundreds of thousands of private- and public-sector jobs, reducing the job creation that otherwise would be expected to occur. Potential strategies for lessening the impact of deep spending cuts include more use of state reserve funds in states that have reserves, more revenue through tax-law changes, and a greater role for the federal government.

#### Only federal stimulus can meet demands

Elizabeth McNichol, M.A. in Political Science from the University of Chicago, 5-24-2012, “States Continue to Feel Recession’s Impact,” Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, http://www.cbpp.org/cms/index.cfm?fa=view&id=711

States already have addressed extraordinarily large shortfalls as they developed and implemented spending plans for fiscal years 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012. Shortfalls are the extent to which states' revenues fall short of the cost of providing services. Every state except Vermont has some sort of balanced-budget law. So the shortfalls for 2009 through 2012 — which totaled more than $530 billion combined — have already been closed through a combination of spending cuts, withdrawals from reserves, revenue increases, and use of federal stimulus dollars. Moreover, a number of states have already closed significant shortfalls for fiscal year 2013.

#### Tolling leads to inefficiency and corruption – tanks solvency

Joan Lowy, Detroit News Staff, 5-27-2012, “States looking at new tolls to repair crumbling roads,” Detroit News, http://www.detroitnews.com/article/20120527/METRO05/205270305#ixzz1wBmbeiEb

Some tolling agencies could also use "a dose of sunshine," Baxandall said. Because many are quasi-governmental, public disclosure, open meeting and other transparency rules don't always apply, he said. As a result, they frequently operate out of public sight, creating opportunities for corruption or manipulation by industry, he said. A report by the New Jersey comptroller in March said cronyism and mismanagement at the Delaware River Port Authority had wasted millions of dollars.

### State Fiscal Challenges Prevent Solvency

#### States have no excess cash

Elizabeth McNichol, M.A. in Political Science from the University of Chicago, 5-24-2012, “States Continue to Feel Recession’s Impact,” Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, http://www.cbpp.org/cms/index.cfm?fa=view&id=711

States continue to face a major fiscal challenge. Thirty states have projected (and in many cases have already closed) budget gaps totaling $54 billion for fiscal year 2013. (See Figure 1.) These shortfalls are all the more daunting because states' options for addressing them are fewer and more difficult than in recent years. Temporary aid to states enacted in early 2009 as part of the federal Recovery Act was enormously helpful in allowing states to avert some of the most harmful potential budget cuts in the 2009, 2010 and 2011 fiscal years. But the federal government allowed that aid to largely expire at the end of fiscal year 2011, leading to some of the deepest cuts to state services since the start of the recession. Far from providing additional assistance to states, the federal government is now moving ahead with spending cuts that will very likely make states' fiscal situation even worse.

#### The permutation solves best by boosting the economy

Elizabeth McNichol, M.A. in Political Science from the University of Chicago, 5-24-2012, “States Continue to Feel Recession’s Impact,” Center for Budget and Policy Priorities, http://www.cbpp.org/cms/index.cfm?fa=view&id=711

Another major obstacle to recovery is sluggish economic growth. Unemployment remains above 8 percent, and many economists expect it to stay at high levels throughout 2012 and beyond. Continued slow job growth will restrain the rise in state tax receipts. This is especially true for the sales tax. High unemployment and economic uncertainty, combined with households' diminished wealth due to fallen property values, will continue to depress consumption, keeping sales tax receipts at low levels. If, as in past recessions, the incomes of the wealthy recover faster than those of low- and middle- income individuals and families, this would mitigate somewhat the effect of a sluggish job market on tax receipts, especially in states with progressive income taxes.

#### That means that the counterplan leads to tolling

Joan Lowy, Detroit News Staff, 5-27-2012, “States looking at new tolls to repair crumbling roads,” Detroit News, http://www.detroitnews.com/article/20120527/METRO05/205270305#ixzz1wBmbeiEb

Tolling is less efficient and sometimes can seem less fair than the main alternative, gasoline taxes. It can increase traffic on side roads as motorists seek to evade paying. Some tolling authorities — often quasi-governmental agencies operating outside the public eye — have been plagued by mismanagement. And some public-private partnerships to build toll roads have drowned in debt because of too-rosy revenue predictions. Tolls are hardly a perfect solution. But to many states and communities, they're the best option available. "It's very hard in this environment for states to add capacity without charging a toll because they can't afford to do it," said Joshua Schank, president of the Eno Center for Transportation, a Washington think tank. "They're barely able to maintain what they've got, and there is an urgent need for capacity."

## Sequestration DA Answers

### Yes Spending

#### Huge spending on foreign aid now – all new money

Reuters 3-29-2012, “U.S. to give $100 million to boost Tunisia finances: Clinton,” http://www.reuters.com/article/2012/03/29/us-tunisia-usa-aid-idUSBRE82S0PB20120329

The United States will give Tunisia $100 million to buttress short-term government finances as the country negotiates a democratic transition following last year's popular uprising, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said on Thursday. Clinton said that, pending congressional notification and approval, the U.S. money would go directly to debt that Tunisia owes the World Bank and the African Development Bank, freeing Tunis to concentrate on its own priority programs and job creation. "As Tunisia progresses into the next phase of its historic democratic transition, the United States is working to help accelerate economic growth that benefits all," Clinton said in a statement. The U.S. cash transfer comes alongside a sovereign loan guarantee now being negotiated between Washington and Tunis that aims to use $30 million from the United States to open up access to several hundred million dollars in new financing from international capital markets. The United States has frequently cited Tunisia as a model for democratic change in the Middle East after a popular revolt forced autocratic leader Zine al-Abidine Ben Ali to flee the country on January 14, 2011, touching off a wave of political unrest across the Arab world. The North African country has since calmly elected its own government, defying predictions it would descend into chaos, while Ben Ali's secret police have been disbanded and the news media enjoy unprecedented freedoms. The Obama administration announced plans last month to extend more than $800 million in economic assistance to countries swept up in the "Arab Spring" revolutions. Officials said the bulk of this would be new money to support long-term economic, political and trade reforms for countries in transition such as Tunisia, Egypt and Yemen.

#### Spending to Egypt now

Steven Lee Myers 3-23-2012, New York Times, “Once Imperiled, U.S. Aid to Egypt Is Restored,” http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/24/world/middleeast/once-imperiled-united-states-aid-to-egypt-is-restored.html?\_r=1

An intense debate within the Obama administration over resuming military assistance to Egypt, which in the end was approved Friday by Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton, turned in part on a question that had nothing to do with democratic progress in Egypt but rather with American jobs at home. A delay or a cut in $1.3 billion in military aid to Egypt risked breaking existing contracts with American arms manufacturers that could have shut down production lines in the middle of President Obama’s re-election campaign and involved significant financial penalties, according to officials involved in the debate. Since the Pentagon buys weapons for foreign armed forces like Egypt’s, the cost of those penalties — which one senior official said could have reached $2 billion if all sales had been halted — would have been borne by the American taxpayer, not Egypt’s ruling generals. The companies involved include Lockheed Martin, which is scheduled to ship the first of a batch of 20 new F-16 fighter jets next month, and General Dynamics, which last year signed a $395 million contract to deliver component parts for 125 Abrams M1A1 tanks that are being assembled at a plant in Egypt. “In large part, there are U.S. jobs that are reliant on the U.S.-Egypt strong military-to-military relationship,” a senior State Department official said, speaking on condition of anonymity under rules set by the department. In deciding how to proceed, the official said, Mrs. Clinton and her colleagues “were looking at our overall national security goals, as well as any domestic issues.” Mrs. Clinton’s decision to resume military assistance, which has been a foundation of United States-Egyptian relations for over three decades, sidestepped a new Congressional requirement that for the first time directly links arms sales to Egypt’s protection of basic freedoms. No new military aid had been delivered since the fiscal year began last October, and Egypt’s military has all but exhausted funds approved in previous years. Mrs. Clinton’s decision provoked sharp criticism from lawmakers across the political spectrum, as well as human rights organizations. Senator Rand Paul, Republican of Kentucky, criticized it as “beyond the pale.” Referring to Egypt’s recent decision to prosecute four American-financed international advocacy organizations, Mr. Paul added, “It sets a precedent that America will not punish its aggressors but instead give them billions of our taxpayers’ dollars.”

### Yes Spending

#### More spending on the way – Obama is pushing

VOA News 3-21-2012, Voice of America News, “USAID Chief Defends Foreign Aid Budget for 2013,” http://blogs.voanews.com/breaking-news/2012/03/21/usaid-chief-defends-foreign-aid-budget-for-2013/

Shah said future U.S. foreign aid investments will be more “prioritized, focused and concentrated,” but promised that U.S. aid will still be able to meet global development challenges. He faced sharp questioning from House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, who called on USAID to consider cutting back aid to countries that no longer need support. “Our foreign aid is not an entitlement program. Countries like Botswana, Chile, Thailand and South Korea have all used U.S. foreign assistance to build their economies and eventually graduate from U.S. foreign assistance. This should be the goal for all countries that receive U.S. assistance.” Ros-Lehtinen said the organization made “modest progress” on its previous budget in eliminating “unnecessary” programs. But she said its current budget proposal does not appear to do enough to encourage countries to become self-sufficient. She specifically criticized U.S. foreign aid funding for environmental initiatives, as well as assistance to the Palestinian Authority and Egypt. She said the money would be better spent on “U.S. national security interests” and democracy promotion programs. The Obama administration requested a $51.6 billion budget for the State Department and USAID for the fiscal year 2013. The proposal is expected to face continued stiff opposition by lawmakers.

### No Sequestration

#### Sequestration won’t happen – movement for repeal is just getting started

Shira Schoenberg, 5-29-2012, “Sen. Scott Brown opposes pending cuts,” Mass Live, http://www.masslive.com/politics/index.ssf/2012/05/sen\_scott\_brown\_opposes\_pendin.html

In a brief interview with MassLive.com after the event, Brown said, “There’s a general consensus no one wants to see the military be devastated by another half a trillion cuts and there’s an effort, as there was in the Defense Authorization bill, to try to find a way to revisit it.” “It’s not over,” Brown said. “There’s a general consensus in a bipartisan manner to (revisit it), and it’s just in its infancy right now.”

#### Congress will ultimately compromise

Robert E. Rubin, former treasury secretary, 5-29-2012, “A Budget Grand Bargain,” CFR, http://www.cfr.org/financial-crises/budget-grand-bargain-follow-election/p28374

Congress's failure to reach a fiscal "grand bargain" last summer manifested the deep economic-policy divide separating Democrats and Republicans. Fortunately, the so-called fiscal cliff will soon create an extraordinary second opportunity for a breakthrough compromise. Washington's continued failure to get our fiscal house in order poses five basic risks. One, government borrowing risks crowding out private investment. Two, our unsustainable fiscal outlook undermines business confidence by creating uncertainty about future policy, economic conditions and our ability to govern, which in turn dampens investment and hiring. Three, deficits constrain our capacity to make the public investment critical to competitiveness, growth and widespread income gains. Four, deficits hamper our financial ability to cope with economic weakness or geopolitical events. And five, our fiscal position creates a strong potential for some form of severe macroeconomic distress at an unpredictable time: high inflation, high interest rates and low confidence in the future that produce an extended period of slow or negative growth, or a harsh financial crisis. Soon after November's election several events will put serious pressure on both parties, possibly providing the impetus for a serious fiscal program. The critical decision-making period will be Congress's lame-duck session after the election, and the first two or three months of the new Congress.

#### Neither party will let it happen

Robert E. Rubin, former treasury secretary, 5-29-2012, “A Budget Grand Bargain,” CFR, http://www.cfr.org/financial-crises/budget-grand-bargain-follow-election/p28374

These events are already understood: The 2001 and 2003 tax cuts for middle-class and upper-income taxpayers, and the payroll tax holiday, will expire at the end of 2012. The dramatic mandatory reduction in spending ("sequestration") required by last year's debt-ceiling deal will take place in January 2013. And the debt ceiling will need to be raised again in late 2012 or early 2013. Each of these events is unacceptable for one or both political parties. Sequestration includes deep cuts to nondefense spending that Democrats oppose, and similarly deep cuts to military spending that make Republicans (and many Democrats) recoil. Republicans oppose the expiration of tax cuts on upper-income Americans, Democrats oppose the expiration of the payroll tax holiday, and members of both parties oppose the expiration of middle-class tax cuts.

### No Economy

#### Recession coming – qualified experts

Chris Isidore, money analyst @ CNN, 2-24-2012, “A new recession seems inevitable,” CNN, p. np

A new recession seems inevitable ECRI is one of the more widely respected firms on economic recessions, as it has never been wrong when forecasting that a recession would start, or failed to predict a recession well before it was widely accepted. Achuthan predicts the recession will happen even without a new shock to the economy, such as a spike in oil and gas prices or a Greek sovereign debt default sparking a financial meltdown. If those things occur, he says they will simply make an inevitable recession more painful. In fact, Achuthan said data gathered since his September forecast only confirms his view that economic growth has slowed to such a degree that a downturn is now unavoidable, likely by late summer. "Now that we have several months of definitive hard data, this is not a forecast," he said, pointing to key measures that don't receive as much attention from the public or many economists. Specifically, he identifies annual growth in industrial production, real personal income and spending, as well as the year-over-year change in gross domestic product, a broad measure of the nation's economic activity. That GDP reading has been stuck between 1.5% and 1.6% growth for the last three quarters, far less encouraging that the rising quarterly GDP, which is more widely reported. "Basically, growth has flatlined," he said.

#### Econ is down

Chris Isidore, money analyst @ CNN, 2-24-2012, “A new recession seems inevitable,” CNN, p. np

He said the so-called velocity of money, the number of times a dollar is spent by consumers, has fallen to a record low in recent months, which he sees as another indicator of underlying weakness. "The world central banks are printing money as never before in history," he said. "The money is not boosting economic growth, but [it's] still there and it goes into risk assets." Achuthan's views are not widely accepted. In a CNNMoney survey of economists in December, they cut the double-dip recession risk to 20% from 30% only three months earlier. The Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia's survey of economists finds that most forecast improved growth and hiring through this year and for the next three years. Achuthan denies that he is taking a bearish view of the economy, saying that when others worried about a double-dip recession risk in the fall of 2010, he saw no signs of a downturn at that time. But more than 50 years of economic data followed by his firm has shown him that when underlying growth slows to this degree, a recession always follows.

#### Double dip coming

Hao Li, 3-15-2012, “US Double-Dip Recession 2012: ECRI, Roubini Say It’s Coming,” International Business Times, http://www.ibtimes.com/articles/314770/20120315/double-dip-recession-2012-roubini.htm

The Economic Cycle Research Institute, or ECRI, a well-regarded forecasting firm, has been predicting for months that a U.S. recession will occur, reaffirming its bearish prognostication Thursday. In December 2011, Lakshman Achuthan, operating chief of the ECRI, said it may take a year for the institute’s bearish forecast to materialize. The central thesis of both forecasters is that loose monetary policy can no longer prop up the U.S. economy, which has weak private-sector growth and faces the threat of expiring fiscal stimulus. “There’ll be more monetary easing and quantitative easing done by the Fed and other central banks, but the credit channel is broken. … We’re going to a recession, we are at stall speed and we are running out of policy bullets,” Roubini told Bloomberg Television. “Can unprecedented, concerted global monetary policy action repeal the business cycle? The objective coincident and leading indexes that we have always monitored are still telling us that it cannot,” the ECRI wrote on its Big Picture blog Thursday. The ECRI’s U.S. Coincident Index, or USCI, which measures current economic conditions, is showing decelerating growth. “It’s an authoritative indication that overall U.S. economic growth is actually worsening, not reviving,” the ECRI stated. The institute asserted that although U.S. non-farm payrolls growth has been strong in recent months, jumping by 227,000 in February, it will likely “start flagging in the coming months” because consumer spending is weak. The ECRI’s Weekly Leading Index, or WLI, designed to anticipate turning points in the U.S. economy by two to three quarters, is recently showing some of the worst growth rates since July 2009. The WLI and USCI track readings of production, employment, income and sales. The institute concluded that its economic indicators give it “no other choice” but to maintain its recession call. One shouldn't take the ECRI’s predictions lightly. The organization corrected called the beginnings of the 2001 and 2007 to 2009 recessions. Perhaps more importantly, the ECRI has issued no false alarms in the last 15 years, according to the New York Times.

### Yes Credit Downgrades

#### Future downgrades are inevitable – status quo spending is enough to trigger the link

Nicholas Ballasy, senior reporter, 2-1-2012, “Sen. Sessions: ‘We’ll continue to see downgrades’” Daily Caller, http://dailycaller.com/2012/02/01/sen-sessions-%E2%80%98we%E2%80%99ll-continue-to-see-downgrades%E2%80%99-of-u-s-credit-rating-video/

Alabama Republican Sen. Jeff Sessions, the ranking member of the Senate Budget Committee, told The Daily Caller that the U.S. will “continue to see downgrades” if the federal government keeps spending at its current level. Sessions also expressed disappointment in President Barack Obama for failing to mention the nation’s $15.2 trillion debt during his State of the Union address. On Wednesday, TheDC asked Sessions if he thinks the U.S. would be downgraded again, as Standard & Poor’s has warned. “Well, that’s very possible because we’re not altering the debt course we’re on,” Sessions replied. “The experts who are looking at our economy — and we’ve had a number of them testify before the budget committee — basically have said we should have started last year.”

#### US has already been downgraded – more is inevitable

Nicholas Ballasy, senior reporter, 2-1-2012, “Sen. Sessions: ‘We’ll continue to see downgrades’” Daily Caller, http://dailycaller.com/2012/02/01/sen-sessions-%E2%80%98we%E2%80%99ll-continue-to-see-downgrades%E2%80%99-of-u-s-credit-rating-video/

“The president in his State of the Union message, I was just deeply disappointed that he made no reference to the threat that debt places, America faces, so it’s going to be hard to do it without the president’s leadership, without looking the American people in the eye and saying, ‘we really do have a problem.’” “If we don’t change this course, we’ll continue to see downgrades,” Sessions added, calling the nation’s debt crisis “predictable.” S&P downgraded the U.S. for the first time in August. U.S. debt is now equal to size of the entire economy.

#### US has been downgraded and will stay that way

John Detrixhe and Sara Eisen, 2-3-2012, “U.S. Lacks Fiscal Plan to Regain AAA Grade,” Bloomberg, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-02-03/u-s-lacks-fiscal-plan-to-regain-aaa-grade-s-p-s-chambers-says.html

The U.S. lacks a medium-term fiscal plan that would remove the negative outlook on the nation’s rating, let alone help it regain its top credit grade, according to John Chambers of Standard & Poor’s.

America has had an AA+ rating with a negative outlook since Aug. 5 when the New York-based unit of McGraw-Hill Cos. stripped the nation of its AAA ranking, citing the government’s failure to agree on a plan to reduce deficits. Countries that lose the top ranking historically have taken about 9 years to regain the grade. “To get back to stable you would have to have some confidence that a medium-term plan would be brought forward, a bit more robust than we have to date,” Chambers, managing director of sovereign ratings at S&P, said today on Bloomberg Radio’s “Bloomberg on the Economy” with Sara Eisen and Michael McKee. “We don’t expect too much before the election. You could have some positive moves after November.”

### Economy Is Resilient

#### Econ is resilient

Gareth Hutchens, 3-17-2012, “Resilient market continues to make gains,” Sydney Morning Herald, http://www.smh.com.au/business/resilient-market-continues-to-make-gains-20120316-1vauy.html

FURTHER promising news on the US economy, and a stay of proceedings for the Greek debt spectacle, gave investors enough confidence to put more money into the sharemarket than they removed this week. Warnings from China's outgoing Premier, Wen Jiabao, that prices in the property market were far from ''reasonable'' provided the week's biggest downer, igniting fears of a slowdown in the world's third-biggest economy. Large falls in commodity prices only added to concerns, particularly for local resource stocks. But the market was resilient enough to withstand the fears, and it ended the week higher overall. For the week, the benchmark S&P/ASX 200 Index rose 64.2 points, or 1.5 per cent, to 4276.2. More positive jobs data from the US provided further signs this week of a genuine pick-up in economic activity, which cheered investors. The news helped to extend a rally on the US market - the Dow Jones rallied for seven straight days, adding 3.5 per cent - and to strengthen the greenback against the local currency, if momentarily. ''It tells us that the momentum of the US recovery is continuing, it's looking like becoming self-sustaining,'' NAB chief economist Rob Henderson said. ''A big drag on the US job market in the last year or so has been job shedding at state and local government levels … but it appears like that's coming to an end.'' Meanwhile, investors seemed to lack enthusiasm for news that Greece's second bailout package had finally been settled, and that the European Financial Stability Facility would give the stricken country €39.4 billion ($A49 billion).

#### Econ is resilient

Ann Sanner, 2-9-2012, “VP Biden touts US economic resiliency at Ohio stop,” AP, http://news.yahoo.com/vp-biden-touts-us-economic-resiliency-ohio-stop-195552914.html

Vice President Joe Biden says he's convinced America is better positioned than other nations to continue to lead the world's economy — whether or not his boss is still in charge. Biden touted the resiliency of the U.S. economy on Thursday during remarks to the Ohio Newspaper Association. He said the economy will continue to provide Americans with decent jobs for years to come whether or not he and President Barack Obama are in office. And he said he's convinced that people are regaining confidence about the country's ability to lead economically. Biden said he believed that in the year 2020 or 2030, the U.S. would be "the single most vibrant economy in the world," adding that is in the world's interest that it is.

#### US economy is resilient

Economic Times, 8-19-2011, “Recession 2011,” http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/international-business/recession-2011-china-says-us-economy-remains-resilient/articleshow/9657932.cms

China's leader-in-waiting on Friday expressed confidence in the battered US economy and warned against politicising trade issues, on the third day of an official visit by America's vice-president. Xi Jinping made the comments at a roundtable of American and Chinese business leaders hosted by Joe Biden, who is trying to shore up the reputation of his country's economy on his five-day trip after a debt crisis. China's Vice President Xi, who is widely expected to be named as the country's next leader in 2012, was speaking ahead of planned talks between Biden and Chinese President Hu Jintao later Friday. "The US economy is highly resilient and has a strong capacity of self repair. We believe that the US economy will achieve even better development as it rises to challenges," said Xi.

### No Economy Impact

#### No wars from econ collapse

Morris Miller, Winter 2000, Interdisciplinary Science Reviews, “Poverty as a cause of wars?” V. 25, Iss. 4, p pq

The question may be reformulated. Do wars spring from a popular reaction to a sudden economic crisis that exacerbates poverty and growing disparities in wealth and incomes? Perhaps one could argue, as some scholars do, that it is some dramatic event or sequence of such events leading to the exacerbation of poverty that, in turn, leads to this deplorable denouement. This exogenous factor might act as a catalyst for a violent reaction on the part of the people or on the part of the political leadership who would then possibly be tempted to seek a diversion by finding or, if need be, fabricating an enemy and setting in train the process leading to war. According to a study undertaken by Minxin Pei and Ariel Adesnik of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, there would not appear to be any merit in this hypothesis. After studying ninety-three episodes of economic crisis in twenty-two countries in Latin America and Asia in the years since the Second World War they concluded that:19 Much of the conventional wisdom about the political impact of economic crises may be wrong ... The severity of economic crisis - as measured in terms of inflation and negative growth - bore no relationship to the collapse of regimes ... (or, in democratic states, rarely) to an outbreak of violence ... In the cases of dictatorships and semidemocracies, the ruling elites responded to crises by increasing repression (thereby using one form of violence to abort another).

#### Historical data proves the Depression didn’t spark WWII.

Niall Ferguson, Professor of History at Harvard University. September/October 2006. “The Next War of the World.” Foreign Affairs. New York: Sep/Oct 2006. Vol. 85, Iss. 5; pg. 61. Proquest.

Nor can economic crises explain the bloodshed. What may be the most familiar causal chain in modern historiography links the Great Depression to the rise of fascism and the outbreak of World War II. But that simple story leaves too much out. Nazi Germany started the war in Europe only after its economy had recovered. Not all the countries affected by the Great Depression were taken over by fascist regimes, nor did all such regimes start wars of aggression. In fact, no general relationship between economics and conflict is discernible for the century as a whole. Some wars came after periods of growth, others were the causes rather than the consequences of economic catastrophe, and some severe economic crises were not followed by wars.

#### Economy is self-correcting

Bill Conerly, principal of Conerly Consulting LLC and chairman of the board of Cascade Policy Institute, 1-11-2009, “Economic Stimulus: More Harm Than Good,” http://businomics.typepad.com/businomics\_blog/2009/01/economic-stimulus-more-harm-than-good.html

The consensus of the economic forecasting profession, as surveyed by the Philadelphia Federal Reserve and The Wall Street Journal, is that economic growth will resume this summer. This point may need some explanation, because many of us have trouble believing that things will ever be different. (Digging out from a major snowstorm it's hard to believe that we'll be sweltering come August.) Here's how the economic recovery will unfold. First, the economy tends to be self-correcting. If not, we would have spiraled out of control many times already. Second, the Federal Reserve has pushed a tremendous amount of stimulus into the economy. There's a long time lag between cause and effect, but monetary policy always works -- it just appears not to be working for months before it finally kicks in. Third, consumers are cutting their spending disproportionately to the decline in incomes. Eventually, the money they are saving will burn a hole in their pockets, leading to a resumption of spending.

### Credit Downgrade Doesn’t Cause Econ Decline

#### Credit downgrade doesn’t lead to decline—American economy is structurally strong

Robert J. Lieber, Professor of Government and International Affairs at Georgetown University, 2011, “Can the US Retain Primacy?”, Israel Journal of foreign Affairs V : 3, http://israelcfr.com/documents/5-3/5-3-4-RobertJLieber.pdf

True, there has been a degree of erosion in America’s economic and military power relative to other countries. However, the margin of strength vis-a-vis other international actors has been so wide that despite some attrition, the US still remains in a unique position as compared with other countries. In contrast to the British experience of imperial decline a century ago, America continues to possess a substantial edge, whether measured in terms of its share of world GDP, depth and size of financial markets, technology, demography, or military power projection. In the percentage of GDP devoted to defense it is not truly overstretched. Even with the costs of war in Afghanistan and continuing military commitments in Iraq and elsewhere, current defense spending at 4.9 percent of GDP remains well below Cold War levels, which averaged 8.7 percent in the 1960s, 5.9 percent in the 1970s, and 5.8 percent in the 1980s. 2 Those who focus on current problems and bitter political debates often lose sight of America’s strengths: The US has the world’s third largest population, enjoys a more favorable demographic profile than China and most other major countries except India, and is the one country in the world that is simultaneously big and rich. America’s great research universities and its scientific facilities are unrivaled. Its competitiveness remains in the top rank, matched only by a few smaller countries such as Singapore and Finland. America continues to be a magnet for talented immigrants from all over the world. The American political system, warts and all, remains flexible and accountable to the public while maintaining constitutional liberties and the rule of law. Time and again, when faced with serious crises, the country has eventually found a way to respond. And contrary to Fareed Zakaria’s claim that success has made it “sclerotic,” a capacity for flexibility, adaptability, and innovation is likely to continue to serve it well.

#### Predictions of American domestic decline are alarmist and empirically denied—flawed methodology

Robert J. Lieber, Professor of Government and International Affairs at Georgetown University, 2011, “Can the US Retain Primacy?”, Israel Journal of foreign Affairs V : 3, http://israelcfr.com/documents/5-3/5-3-4-RobertJLieber.pdf

Long-term predictions are notoriously hard to get right, as evident in repeated warnings and prophecies about American decline from the late eighteenth century to the present. Samuel Huntington, writing nearly a quarter century ago, identified no fewer than five waves of contemporary declinism: in 1957–58 after the Soviet launching of Sputnik; in 1969–71 when President Richard M. Nixon proclaimed the end of the bipolar world and abandoned the gold standard; in 1973–74 in the aftermath of the Yom Kippur War and a disruptive oil shock; in the late 1970s after Vietnam, Watergate, and a surge in Soviet assertiveness; and in 1987, with major budget and trade deficits, the rise of Japan, and an October 1987 stock market crash. 3 Yet, the decade ended not with the demise of the US, but with the collapse of the Berlin Wall, the end of the Cold War, and an emerging consensus about American primacy and unipolarity. Since that time, assessments of the US have continued to oscillate, whether expressed in terms of its extraordinary power and influence or in warning of its vulnerability and weakness. With the beginning of the 1990s, in the aftermath of the defeat of Saddam Hussein’s forces in Kuwait and the breakup of the Soviet Union, observers of America who only a few years earlier had offered gloomy forecasts now described the US as the lone superpower, not just in military and geopolitical terms, but in the triumph of the American model of market capitalism and liberal democracy.

### Moody’s Won’t Downgrade The US

#### AAA rating is secure regardless of the super committee—prefer our ev. It’s the only card from Moody’s

Frank Thorp, Staff Writer, 11-1-2011, “Ratings agency: No change in U.S. credit”, MSNBC: First Read, http://firstread.msnbc.msn.com/\_news/2011/11/01/8582525-ratings-agency-no-change-in-us-credit

The nation's AAA credit rating will likely stay put no matter what the outcome of the Deficit Supercommittee later this month, according to a report released today by the ratings agency Moody's. On Aug. 2nd, just days before S&P's downgrade of the nation's credit rating from AAA to AA+, Moody's confirmed it's AAA rating but assigned it a negative outlook. According the Moody's report, due to the fact that the nation's deficit will be reduced both if the Supercommittee reaches an agreement or not, Moody's does not anticipate any change in their credit rating of the U.S. "Agreement by the Joint Select Committee and the Congress as a whole on a larger amount of deficit reduction would be favorable,” the report states, “but the smaller amount triggered by the spending caps is still a step in the same direction. Thus, the committee outcome will not necessarily lead to any change in our rating stance." According to the Budget Control Act passed in August, if the Supercommittee does not come to an agreement on at least $1.2 trillion in deficit reduction by Nov. 23rd, an automatic "trigger"

#### Super committee failure isn’t a decisive factor in a downgrade

Tom Petruno, Staff Writer, 11-12-2011, “Europe mess gives U.S. a reprieve on debt comeuppance”, Los Angeles Times, http://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-1112-petruno-markets-20111112,0,2382307.column

S&P's main rival, Moody's Investors Service, still rates the U.S. Aaa. But Moody's has a negative outlook on its rating, meaning that a cut is possible. Even so, Moody's said earlier this month that the success or failure of the super committee wouldn't by itself be a "decisive" factor in whether the U.S. retains the Aaa grade. For now, it appears that neither S&P nor Moody's is poised to react quickly even if partisan politics keep Democrats and Republicans on the super committee from agreeing on serious budget cuts.

#### Moody’s isn’t on the brink of downgrading, and ratings drops are empirically denied by Europe

Paul Wiseman, 1-15-2012, “Downgrading Europe,” Time Business, http://www.time.com/time/business/article/0,8599,2104519,00.html

The decision by Standard & Poor's to strip France of its prized AAA credit rating and downgrade eight other European countries slammed a continent struggling with a debt crisis and an economic slowdown. But beleaguered Europeans can take some comfort: It could have been worse. Investors had plenty of time to brace for the bad news. S&P put 15 countries, including Germany and France, on notice last month that they faced potential downgrades. The advance notice means the downgrades likely won't panic financial markets and drive up European governments' borrowing costs much higher than they already are. "People knew it was coming, and it was only one rating agency," said Marc Chandler, head of global currency strategy at Brown Brothers Harriman. Moody's and Fitch Ratings have yet to follow S&P.

### US Not Key To Global Economy

#### No impact to economic decline – other nations stabilize markets

John Ross, Econ Professor, 1-3-2009, “The decline in US asset prices and the perspectives for the global economy,” Key Trends in the World Economy, http://ablog.typepad.com/key\_trends\_in\_the\_world\_e/2009/01/the-decline-in-us-asset-prices-and-the-perspectives-for-the-global-economy.html

The world economy has already been saved once from the consequences of US financial crisis in the last economic period. Following the 1987 US stock market crash the export of financial resources from Japan, carried out via an ultra-expansionary monetary policy, played a crucial role in stabilising both US and world financial markets. Whether Japan was wise to purse these policies in the particular form it did, in light of the consequent Japanese 'bubble economy' and financial crash which commenced in 1990, is another issue, but it showed that there was now an 'economic backstop' for the US in the world economy in a way that one had not existed in 1929. This economic strength of China, and to a lesser extent India, therefore significantly alters the situation of the world economy compared to 1929 - despite any apparent parallels on financial markets. Provided there are not disastrous economic policy miscalculations by the US, which of course are possible, international macro-economic fundamentals mean there need be no 1930s style depression. However there will be, instead, a deep recession of the global economy out of which China and India will emerge significantly strengthened in their relative weight in the world economy. This is therefore the conclusion which flows from consideration of international economic fundamentals.

#### The US isn’t key to the global economy

Chris Devonshire-Ellis, Senior Partner of Dezan Shira & Associates and publisher of China Briefing, interviewed by AFP, January 24, 2008, U.S. recession fears not a global concern for China, India and the developing world

AFP: Everyone is saying the U.S. is having a recession; we want to do a story on the emerging markets power, say China and India. Since your firm is very familiar with these markets and the topic, we’d like to have your opinion on the following questions. Can China and India help the world lessen the impact of a global economic slowdown? CDE: Yes. Neither markets are particularly integrated with the United States and both have market fundamentals that have separately evolved from the West over the past 60 years. The media quotes the Shanghai bourse for example, but it’s unnecessary, the Shanghai market isn’t interactive with global markets and serves only China’s domestic market. Mumbai is more connected but India is going through a domestic consumer boom. What happens in the US has little impact on these markets. So by definition China and India will not participate in a worldwide recession and will therefore be hedges against this. Welcome to globalization. It’s protective as we will see. The United States has problems; however these will be offset against markets elsewhere. The new world order is working.

#### China and India can fill in

Chris Devonshire-Ellis, Senior Partner of Dezan Shira & Associates and publisher of China Briefing, interviewed by AFP, January 24, 2008, U.S. recession fears not a global concern for China, India and the developing world

AFP: Are their engines strong enough to power the world economy? Why or why not? CDE: China and India possess 40 percent of the world’s population. OK, so maybe 20 percent of this can purchase to international standards, however combined this is still larger than the U.S. disposable middle class income. Plus, both largely supply much of the world’s consumer goods. The global wheels will keep turning. Mexico also and to a lesser, yet significant extent, Brazil and Russia will help too. Their fundamentals are strong in the global financial supply chain and will keep us globally out of this problem. The reality is America alone cannot control the global economy, which now finally is correct. We now have a better international balance. As I mentioned before, globalization is here, it has arrived, and it’s about to bail out a weak market – the United States – as the U.S. has done before. It’s more a maturity of other markets than a major U.S. default that has brought us to this point. Safety lies in numbers.

### Deficit Reduction Bad – Warming

#### Deficit focus destroys US ability to stop warming - can’t regulate developing countries

Rebecca Lefton, Masters in Public Policy from U Chicago and Researcher for Progressive Media at American Progress, 9-13-2011, “The Debt Deal and Budget Process Threaten Critical Climate Aid Funding”, Center for American Progress, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/09/climate\_aid.html

Evidence of climate change is mounting as impacts are already being felt here at home and in developing countries that have contributed the least to the cause. The acceptance by all major economies that global temperatures should rise no more than 2 degrees Celsius was a major milestone in the international climate change negotiations process in recent years, but scientists are advising that reductions will need to be higher. Here in the United States, Congress has still not passed comprehensive climate and energy legislation, and climate deniers are unwilling to tackle problems that they don’t believe even exist. But whatever progress is made on cuts in developed countries, they will not be enough to achieve climate safety. In conjunction with more ambitious actions in developed countries, the only way to stabilize emissions is to ensure developing countries grow in a more sustainable manner as these are the countries that will see the largest population increases this century. Consequently, our international climate financial commitments are even more critical for achieving emissions reductions by leveraging climate action in fast-rising greenhouse-gas-emitting developing countries. Further, in the absence of a binding international climate treaty, the flow of climate finance is necessary for keeping parties at the table. But the United States’ ability to meet our climate aid goals is endangered by shortsighted vision as evidenced by the debt deal and ongoing budget process. What follows is an outline of how the deal and budget negotiations could affect climate assistance and CAP’s proposals for appropriate U.S. funding going forward.

#### Warming causes extinction. [Gender Paraphrased]

Bill Henderson, Environmental Scientist. 8-16-2006. Counter Currents, “Runaway Global Warming Denial.” http://www.countercurrents.org/cc-henderson190806.htm

The scientific debate about human induced global warming is over but policy makers - let alone the happily shopping general public - still seem to not understand the scope of the impending tragedy. Global warming isn't just warmer temperatures, heat waves, melting ice and threatened polar bears. Scientific understanding increasingly points to runaway global warming leading to human extinction. If impossibly Draconian security measures are not immediately put in place to keep further emissions of greenhouse gases out of the atmosphere we are looking at the death of billions, the end of civilization as we know it and in all probability the end of [hu]man's several million year old existence, along with the extinction of most flora and fauna beloved to man in the world we share.

#### We can still stop the worst of global warming – developing country emissions cuts key

David Doniger et al, policy director of the Climate Center for the Natural Resources Defense Council, Antonia V. Herzog and Daniel A. Lashof, 11-3-2006,“An Ambitious, Centrist Approach to Global Warming Legislation,” Science, http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/314/5800/764

There is growing concern that global warming of more than 2°C from pre-industrial levels could have dangerous climatic consequences (1, 2). It is estimated that, to avoid exceeding this 2° target, heat-trapping gas and aerosol concentrations need to be stabilized so that their net radiative effect is less than that of 450 parts per million (ppm) CO2 (3). This could be achieved if the United States and other industrial nations cut current emissions by 60 to 80% by 2050, and if developing countries limit emissions growth and impose similar reductions later in the century.

## Jackson-Vanik DA Answers

### No Obama PC – LOST Thumper

#### Obama is pushing LOST and it’s controversial

Michelle Malkin, 5-28-2012, “Obama’s ‘Land of the LOST,’” Del Marva Now, http://www.delmarvanow.com/article/20120528/OPINION01/205280318

What's green and blue and grabby all over? President Obama's new pressure campaign for Congress to ratify the Law of the Sea Treaty, aka LOST. The fight over LOST goes back three decades, when it was first rejected by President Ronald Reagan. He warned that "no national interest of the United States could justify handing sovereign control of two-thirds of the Earth's surface over to the Third World." According to top Reagan officials William Clark and Ed Meese, their boss believed the "central, and abiding, defect" was "its effort to promote global government at the expense of sovereign nation states -- and most especially the United States."

#### It’s Obama’s top priority

Andrew Burt, Yale law, 5-25-2012, “Why U.S. Senate should ratify Law of the Sea Treaty,” The Hill, http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/229559-why-us-senate-should-ratify-law-of-the-sea-treaty

The good news is that, as of last week, the administration appears to have taken up the cause. “Accession to this treaty is absolutely essential,” Defense Secretary Leon Panetta told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Wednesday. “We believe that it is imperative to act now,” said Hillary Clinton. Martin Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, added that the treaty might even help prevent future wars by providing new venues to “stave off conflict with less risk of escalation.”

#### LOST won’t pass – opposition is still fierce

Andrew Burt, Yale law, 5-25-2012, “Why U.S. Senate should ratify Law of the Sea Treaty,” The Hill, http://thehill.com/blogs/congress-blog/foreign-policy/229559-why-us-senate-should-ratify-law-of-the-sea-treaty

But doubts over finding the 67 votes needed in the Senate remain. The last time UNCLOS made it to the floor was under the George W. Bush Administration’s backing. Mark Helmke, a spokesman for Senator Dick Lugar (R-Ind.), a key supporter of the treaty, explained that effort to me in a conversation last year: “It’s a classic case where a well-organized minority can stop something that is supported by the broad majority.” Far-right groups used the “internationalist” threat they saw in the treaty for fundraising, and Lugar’s office was berated with phone calls from constituents who sincerely worried “that the law of the sea meant the U.N. could take over every single fishing pond in the state.” UNCLOS died on the Senate floor. The Obama Administration deserves credit for tackling a long-ignored but pressing issue, especially in an election year. Now it’s the Senate’s turn to take note: the longer it waits to ratify the treaty, the blacker Uncle Sam’s eye will be.

### No Obama PC – Euro Collapse Thumper

#### Eurozone collapse coming

David C Pack, editor and chief of the real truth, 3-14-2012, “Will Europe’s Economy Collapse?” The Real Truth, http://realtruth.org/articles/120306-006.html

In the end, the current policy is self-defeating. These countries are trapped in a death spiral that threatens to bring down Europe and even the very global economy. Today, the foundation of the world’s financial markets is crumbling. European leaders are desperately trying to save their system. In meeting after meeting—summit after summit!—they try to find a way out of the abyss. Opinions Abound Many opinions exist about how the crisis should be solved. One idea is to contain the problem by acting conservatively and not taking drastic actions, instead implementing gradual reforms. This would at best have a limited impact, and would also lead to continued uncertainty in financial markets. Further erosion of confidence would continue pushing up borrowing rates. Many countries would be unable to pay debts or borrow enough to survive. The recession would only spread—and deepen. A second option is to allow certain countries to default, but then manage their return to financial health. If Greece, Portugal, Ireland or other smaller countries defaulted, a customized solution could be implemented to help each economy recover. But this approach is dangerous as investors would suffer catastrophic losses, leading to a banking crisis of unimaginable proportions. Are you following the seriousness here? People are searching for a clear, strong hand!

#### Kills Obama’s political capital

Ezra Klein, staff writer, 2-6-2012, “Wonkbook: Obama's fresh lead remains vulnerable to Europe's woes,” Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/post/wonkbook-obamas-fresh-lead-remains-vulnerable-to-europes-woes/2012/02/06/gIQANzUbtQ\_blog.html

So the question as we look towards Greece's troubles today and the Eurozone over the next year is whether the rules governing the macro question -- whether the Eurozone will survive -- trump the rules governing the everyday panics and political decisions that imperil its survival. Or perhaps there's some theory that can bring them both together. The answer to this question, perhaps more than any other, will decide whether Obama's momentum continues, or fizzles out amidst a new economic crisis.

#### Will Effect Obama—kills election and p.c.

Byron Tau, Politico contributor, 3-29-2012, “Biden Something in the Gulf, Eurozone could bring down Obama”, <http://www.politico.com/politico44/2012/03/biden-something-in-the-gulf-eurozone-could-bring-down-119136.html>

Vice President Joe Biden Thursday made some oblique references to a possible war in Iran — or a Eurozone collapse — bringing the Obama presidency to an end in November. Speaking to donors in Chicago, Biden said that it was not the GOP candidates that he feared — but rather events outside of the administration's control, like a military conflict in the Persian Gulf or a collapse of the European economy.

### No JV Repeal

#### JV repeal won’t pass – it’s not even on the summer agenda

Erik Wasson and Vicki Needham, 5-25-2012, “Russia trade, farm bill not on House summer calendar,” The Hill, http://thehill.com/blogs/on-the-money/1005-trade/229563-russia-trade-farm-bill-not-on-house-summer-calendar

House Majority Leader Eric Cantor (R-Va.) released the chamber's summer calendar to lawmakers on Friday, and it is missing two major economic items, a 2013 farm bill and major Russia trade legislation. The 2008 farm bill expires on Sept. 30, and if it is not renewed nutrition and commodity payments would be in jeopardy. Congress needs to act before Russia's legislature votes to join the World Trade Organization, which should happen by August. The Senate is set to take up its version of a 2013 farm bill in early June and the House and Senate committees with jurisdiction over trade have said they would hold hearings on the issue this summer.

#### JV repeal won’t pass the house

Vestnik Kavkaza, 3-16-2012, “Lift of Jackson-Vanik amendments postponed,” http://vestnikkavkaza.net/news/economy/24261.html

Consideration of lift of the Jackson-Vanik amendments has been postponed by the US Senate until summer 2012 after ratification of WTO membership at the Russian parliament, head of the Senate’s Committee for Finances Max Bakus said, RIA Novosti reports. Igor Rudensky, Chairman of the Russian Parliamentary Committee for Economic Policy, said after a meeting with Russian Minister for Economic Development Elvira Nabiullina that ratification is planned in May-June. It is unclear whether the House of Representatives controlled by the Republicans will get enough votes. The press service of the committee for finances said that senators will discuss the issue in the near future. Discussions and votes are usually announced 48 hours ahead. The Jackson-Vanik amendments were passed by the US Congress in 1974, limiting trade with the USSR as a response to migration limitations in the latter. Moratorium on the amendments has been prolonged every year since 1989. US officials say that the amendments will not allow American businessmen to make full use of operating in Russia after it joins the WTO this summer. Some Republicans are still opposed to lifting the amendments.

#### Repeal won’t pass – election politics

RIA Novosti, 3-28-2012, “Anti-Russian Amendment Now Headache for U.S.”, http://russian-untouchables.com/eng/2012/03/anti-russian-amendment-now-headache-for-u-s/

Economic sanctions against Russia imposed by the United States in 1974 could backfire on America this year, but are likely to stay in place because of persistent political and ideological grudges between the two Cold War rivals, analysts said. The Jackson-Vanik amendment was defunct in practice over the last two decades, but things got tricky after Russia completed its 18-year-long path to the World Trade Organization (WTO) last year, with more than a little help from the White House. WTO rules ban formal trade restrictions such as the Jackson-Vanik amendment, which means the United States could face economic sanctions from Moscow and pressure from WTO once Russia completes the treaty’s ratification, expected this summer. Elections First “Russia has no practical interest in canceling the Jackson-Vanik amendment,” Konstantin Kosachyov, then-State Duma lawmaker with United Russia and deputy head of the international affairs committee at the lower chamber, said in late February. “Common sense predicts it will be canceled this summer. But it may become a hostage of the election campaign in the United States,” Kosachyov said. The administration of U.S. President Barack Obama is making a push to have Congress formally repeal the Jackson-Vanik amendment in regard to Russia, but this is unlikely to happen before the U.S. presidential elections in November, according to Russian and American pundits contacted by RIA Novosti. Kosachyov’s prediction was echoed by Angela Stent of Georgetown University and Valery Garbuzov of the Russian Institute of the United States and Canada, both of whom said the Jackson-Vanik is expected to stay in place until the U.S. presidential elections.

### JV Repeal Will Be Linked To Magnitsky

#### JV repeal will get linked to Magnitsky – kills relations

Alexander Gasyuk, staff writer, 3-16-2012, “Trade hearings renew debates on Russia,” Russia Beyond the Headlines, http://rbth.ru/articles/2012/03/16/jackson-vanik\_trade\_hearings\_renew\_debates\_on\_russia\_15086.html

The United States Senate Finance Committee began hearings Thursday on abolishing controversial trade restrictions against Russia under the Soviet-era Jackson-Vanik amendment. American lawmakers will debate the end of trade practices, which have long prevented granting Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) status to Moscow. It is still unclear clear whether the Obama administration will convince Congress to lift the decades-old law and if so on what terms. The Jackson-Vanik amendment was adopted in 1974, when it linked restrictions on trade with the right of Jews to emigrate from the Soviet Union. That issue has been dead since the collapse of the U.S.S.R., if not before. Some lawmakers and analysts believe lifting the amendment could be a boon for U.S.-Russia trade. Senate Finance Committee Chairman Max Baucus (D-Mont.), said that lifting the provision could double U.S. exports to Russia. And Anders Aslund, a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute, said that that exports could increase to $20 billion annually in five years. Edward Verona, the president and CEO of the U.S.-Russia Business Council, which supports repeal, said about 50,000 U.S. jobs depend on trade with Russia and those numbers could be significantly boosted by more open trade. However if the Jackson-Vanik amendment is still on the books by the time Russia officially joins the World Trade Organization this summer, U.S. companies will find themselves at a disadvantage in the Russian market. Unlike competitors from other countries, they will not be protected by WTO rules and Moscow could choose to retaliate against American companies with tariffs and other barriers. The American business community with interests in Russia has been actively lobbying the U.S. Congress for months; the administration has also become animated in its support of lifting the restrictions. “It really needs to happen before Russia joins WTO otherwise American companies will be penalized,” Philip Gordon, an assistant secretary of state, told RBTH on the first day of senate hearings. Last week, during a meeting with U.S. business leaders, President Barack Obama emphasized that granting PNTR to Russia is necessary for American companies to benefit from Russia's entry into the WTO. A similar message was carried to Capitol Hill senior officials from Secretary of State Hillary Clinton to U.S. Trade Representative Ron Kirk. In Congress, however, there is a sense that the United States shouldn’t repeat mistakes it made with China, according to Jeffrey Mankoff of the Washington, D.C.-based Council on Foreign Relations, a private think tank. “Beijing’s entry to the WTO in the early 2000s didn’t result in the resolution of several important trade issues such as intellectual property rights, piracy, tariff policy and human rights concerns,” he said. “After graduating China from Jackson-Vanik, some in Congress thought America had lost effective leverage over Beijing.” Sharp differences between Moscow and Washington on the situation in Syria and U.S. concerns about human rights in Russia do not encourage U.S. lawmakers to “make concessions to Russia,” he added. A recent report prepared by the Washington, D.C.-based Bipartisan Policy Center urges Congress “to enact legislation that graduates Russia from Jackson-Vanik,” but also argues for the promotion of human rights and civil society in the country. Some Republican and Democratic lawmakers also want to link the trade issue issues of human rights and corruption in Russia to the passage of the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2011, named for the anti-corruption lawyer who died in a Russian prison more than two years ago. The Magnitsky Bill is intended to put dozens of Russian officials along with their relatives on a U.S. visa ban list as well as to freeze their assets in American banks. If it is adopted it will inflame U.S.-Russia relations, and invite retaliation from Moscow. David Kramer, executive president of the democracy and human rights watchdog Freedom House, who will be testifying on Jackson-Vanik on Capitol Hill, told RBTH that the “only way to lift Jackson-Vanik is to link it to passage of Magnitsky.”

#### Magnitsky and JV will be a quid-pro-quo

WSJ, 3-20-2012, “After Jackson-Vanik,” http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304459804577285330434798916.html?mod=googlenews\_wsj

For two years, the White House has scuttled the Magnitsky bill. Senate Foreign Relations Chairman John Kerry, who dreams of the top job at Foggy Bottom in a second Obama term, refuses to hold hearings. Mike McFaul, the new ambassador to Russia, last week called it "redundant" because the State Department put some Russian officials on a visa black list last year. He didn't mention that it only did so in response to Senate pressure and in an effort to pre-empt Senate action. Nor did he say that, unlike the Magnitsky bill, State didn't publicly name names or ban them from using the U.S. banking system. This position is no longer politically tenable. The Senate looks unlikely to retire Jackson-Vanik without adopting the Magnitsky bill. On Friday, Senator Cardin, Republicans John McCain and Roger Wicker and independent Joe Lieberman made this quid pro quo explicit. Mr. Cardin's participation is noteworthy coming from a loyal Democrat. So is the promise by Mr. McCain to support Jackson-Vanik repeal as long as the Magnitsky law gets thrown into the bargain. Mr. McCain may bring along Republicans who currently want to keep Jackson-Vanik, which the Administration still lacks votes to repeal. The White House reluctance to sanction Russian human-rights abusers speaks to a bigger clash over foreign policy visions. Seeing itself as an heir to the "realist" school, the Obama Administration extends a hand to dictators and plays down talk of democracy and human rights. In its view, a waning global power like America can't afford to annoy authoritarian regimes this way. But an American voice on behalf of the powerless is part of a long, bipartisan tradition. We're glad some Senators think it's worth preserving.

### Jackson-Vanik DA Answers

#### Magnitsky will get attached now

Seth Mandel, staff writer, 3-15-2012, “Kasparov, Nemtsov call McFaul’s Bluff,” Commentary, http://www.commentarymagazine.com/2012/03/15/kasparov-nemtsov-call-mcfaul-bluff/

On Tuesday, I wrote about U.S. Ambassador to Moscow Michael McFaul’s objection to tying America’s economic interaction with Russia to the promotion of human rights. McFaul was in Washington for a conference and also to push for repeal of the Jackson-Vanik amendment, a piece of Cold War-era legislation that sanctioned Moscow’s trade status for restricting Jewish emigration. Now that Russia is joining the World Trade Organization, Jackson-Vanik disadvantages American businesses, and so it’s time to repeal it. But I argued that McFaul’s emphasis on repealing Jackson-Vanik was a dodge, since its repeal is uncontroversial. The real issue is whether it should be replaced by legislation that would hold Vladimir Putin’s administration accountable for its atrocious human rights record. Were McFaul not representing the Obama administration, I added, he might very well support such action–McFaul is the author of several books on promoting democracy in the post-Soviet space. Today, Garry Kasparov and Boris Nemtsov, two outspoken Russian opposition figures, take to the pages of the Wall Street Journal to make those points, and a few others. The authors note that McFaul challenged a crowd on Monday to ask Aleksei Navalny, a popular Russian activist and blogger who has become a vocal leader of the protest movement, what he thinks. McFaul was certain his interlocutors would decline to accept the challenge. Kasparov and Nemtsov called McFaul’s bluff: So we asked Mr. Navalny, who, along with several other members of the opposition leadership, signed a letter cited by Mr. McFaul calling for the removal of Russia from Jackson-Vanik. “Of course no one in Russia is foolish enough to defend Jackson-Vanik,” he told us. “But we also understand that it should be replaced with something else. And we said as much in our letter when we recommended the passing of the Magnitsky Act, as has been done in Europe.” Mr. Navalny is referring to the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2011, which was introduced in the U.S. Senate last May with wide bipartisan support. Named for the Russian attorney who died in police custody in 2009 while investigating official corruption, the Magnitsky Act would bring visa and asset sanctions against Russian government functionaries culpable of criminal and human rights abuses.

### Magnitsky Worse For Relations

#### Kills the relationship – they stop cooperating on Iran and Afghanistan

Ben Birnbaum, staff writer, 11-28-2011, “Russia's WTO accession sparks debate over human-rights legislation,” The Washington Times, http://www.america-russia.net/eng/security/292971236

The debate over punishing Russian human-rights abusers and voiding a Cold War-era trade law poses a test for the Obama administration's 'reset' in relations with the former Soviet republic. As a WTO member, Russia would enjoy regulated access to U.S. markets, even as Moscow has backslid on democratic reforms by cracking down on dissenters, limiting opposition and restricting the press. Russia has threatened to end cooperation with the U.S. on Iran sanctions and Afghan transit if the U.S. implements the proposed Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act.

#### Russia retaliates – Iran and Afghanistan

Jacqueline McLaren Miller, Senior Associate in EWI, 3-14-2012, “The Next Round on Jackson-Vanik,” East West Institute, http://www.ewi.info/next-round-jackson-vanik

Nonetheless, the opposition leaders advocate selective sanctioning of Russian officials complicit in human rights abuses and mention the Magnitsky legislation by name. The State Department, however, has already instituted a visa ban on some officials believed to be linked to Magnitsky’s death, and it argues that the new legislation would mandate investigations of assets of Russian officials that would be difficult to carry out. There are also concerns that provisions of the Magnitsky bills are illegal (such as not providing an appeal mechanism for those sanctioned) or of dubious precedent (punishing people who have not been found guilty of a crime). The administration is also concerned that the Russian government would retaliate against the Magnitsky legislation by withholding cooperation on Iran, the Northern Distribution Network to Afghanistan and other strategically important areas.

#### Human rights pressure kills cooperation

Mark Adomanis, staff writer, 3-15-2012, “It's Time to End the Jackson-Vanik Amendment,” Forbes, http://www.forbes.com/sites/markadomanis/2012/03/15/its-time-to-end-the-jackson-vanik-amendment/

As someone who thinks that “morality,” as such, should play no role whatsoever in the formulation of foreign policy, I personally find the whole McFaul-Kramer fight to be more than a little bit silly. Given its predilection for drone assassinations literally the last thing the United States government wants to do is set a precedent through which foreign legislatures have the power to pass criminal convictions on politically convenient targets (it’s us targeting Russian officials today – it could just as easily be France or Spain targeting American officials tomorrow). Even if the US didn’t have to worry about the worrying precedents of pending human-rights legislation, there is the small matter that we simply need to deal with the Russians on a number of important issues. It’s not exactly shocking that if we constantly demonize and berate them, they will be less interested in cooperating with us.

### No TOD

#### Not top of the docket and passage is inevitable

Alexander Gasyuk, staff writer, 3-16-2012, “Trade hearings renew debates on Russia,” Russia Beyond the Headlines, http://rbth.ru/articles/2012/03/16/jackson-vanik\_trade\_hearings\_renew\_debates\_on\_russia\_15086.html

Presidential politics could also delay resolution of the issue. Mankoff said Republicans have no incentive to repeal Jackson-Vanik now. “But at the end of the day I think economic sense will prevail and perhaps sometime after the November elections PNTR [permanent normal trade relations] will be provided to Russia,” he said.

#### Baucus wont release the bill till summer

RIA Novosti, 3-16-2012, “U.S. to Debate Jackson-Vanik after Russia Ratifies WTO Deal,” http://en.rian.ru/business/20120316/172196120.html

The U.S. Congress will consider the abolition of the Cold War-era Jackson-Vanik Amendment this summer after the Russian parliament’s lower house, the State Duma, ratifies an agreement on joining the World Trade Organization (WTO), a senior U.S. official said. Max Baucus, the chairman of the U.S. Senate Committee on Finance, told journalists that the bill on the amendment, a major hurdle in bilateral trade with Russia, will be passed on to the Senate after Washington is certain that Russia joins the WTO.

#### May or June

Voice of Russia, 3-16-2012, “U.S. Senate to consider repeal of Jackson-Vanik amendment,” http://english.ruvr.ru/2012\_03\_16/68598486/

The U.S. Senate will examine the issue of repealing the Soviet-era Jackson-Vanik amendment after Russia’s WTO accession. This was announced by chairman of the Senate Finance Committee Max Backus. Earlier, the Senator for the first time officially appealed to colleagues to drop the amendment at Congress hearings. The agreement on Russia's accession to the WTO will be put up for ratification in the Duma - the lower house of Russian parliament – at its spring session, tentatively in May or June.

### US-Russian Relations Alt-Causes

#### Putin is crazy – he’ll kill relations

Dick Krickus, distinguished professor emeritus at the University of Mary Washington, former H.L. Oppenheimer Chair for Warfighting Strategy at the U.S. Marine Corps University, 2-3-2012, “United States Looms Large in Russian Elections,” CDI, http://www.cdi.org/russia/johnson/russia-us-looms-large-russian-election-336.cfm

Perhaps! But there is another explanation for Putin's crusade: he really believes the American ruling elite is seeking regime change in Moscow much as it did in Tbilisi, Cairo, and Tripoli, is doing in Damascus and tried to do in Kiev. If Putin is convinced of this, it is a truly ominous development. Such paranoia could foster irrational policies and misperceptions that precipitate friction between Moscow and Washington during a turbulent year of dual presidential elections.

#### NMD is the biggest issue

Nancy Benac, staff writer, 5-26-2011, “U.S., Russia To Work On Missile Defense: Obama,” Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/05/26/us-russia-missile-defense-g8-deauville\_n\_867341.html

DEAUVILLE, France — It is no simple thing to push the "reset" button on U.S.-Russian relations. Trying to move beyond years of inherited mistrust, President Barack Obama and Russian President Dmitry Medvedev claimed progress Thursday but achieved no breakthrough on a U.S. missile defense plan that Moscow is concerned could threaten its security. The two leaders went out of their way to stress – four times over – that their relationship was good But Medvedev also acknowledged: "It does not mean that we'll have common views and coinciding views on all the issues. It's impossible." And a White House aide acknowledged that on the missile defense question, for years the single most confrontational issue in the U.S.-Russian relationship, both sides still were trying to overcome "old thinking," and the Russians, in short, "don't believe us." The two sides have long been in negotiations over U.S. intentions to station missile interceptors in Central and Eastern Europe. Russia believes the plan could threaten its own missile arsenal despite U.S. assurances to the contrary.

#### Putin ensures low US-Russia relations

Andrew C. Kuchins, director and senior fellow of the Russia program at CSIS, 3-1-2012, “The End of the 'Reset',” Foreign Affairs, http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/137308/andrew-c-kuchins/the-end-of-the-reset?page=2&cid=rss-rss\_xml-the\_end\_of\_the\_reset-000000

But now those propositions look highly dubious. Putin's latest campaign article, "Russia and the Changing World," makes clear that the so-called reset in U.S.-Russia relations is over, and that tough times lie ahead. Addressing his own question -- "Who undermines confidence?" -- Putin pointed at the United States and NATO, but especially at the Americans, who "have become obsessed with the idea of becoming absolutely invulnerable." Some may write off Putin's anti-American tone as campaign rhetoric, but it has become increasingly clear that his brash posture toward Washington reflects what he actually thinks about the United States and its foreign policy. In fact, Putin has long held these views. Today it's as if Putin has dialed the U.S.-Russia relationship back to 2007, when he unleashed his anti-American diatribe at the Wehrkunde security conference in Munich. Then, Putin's anti-Americanism was angry and aggressive; now, as Russian foreign affairs expert Fyodor Lukyanov told a Washington audience this week, "his anti-Americanism is defensive." He sees foreign policy challenges at every turn, especially Europe's debt fiasco and China's rise; these are dilemmas over which he has little control. But domestic political stability is his principal concern, and Putin sees the United States as a threat to his sovereign rule. Anti-Americanism, at least to some extent, has been a staple of Russian political campaign rhetoric since the onset of the Putin era, but never like this. The rapprochement in U.S.-Russia relations had already begun to slow last spring over the Western military intervention in Libya and the breakdown in discussions about missile defense cooperation. Putin announced his return to the presidency on September 24, 2011, and subsequently the tone of Russian statements about differences with Washington on Syria, the Iranian nuclear program, and missile defense plans sharpened.

### US-Russia Relations Resilient

#### Relations resilient and no risk of war – cold war proves

Richard Weitz, staff writer, 9-27-2011, “Global Insights: Putin not a Game-Changer for U.S.-Russia Ties,” World Politics Review, http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/10140/global-insights-putin-not-a-game-changer-for-u-s-russia-ties

Fifth, there will inevitably be areas of conflict between Russia and the United States regardless of who is in the Kremlin. Putin and his entourage can never be happy with having NATO be Europe's most powerful security institution, since Moscow is not a member and cannot become one. Similarly, the Russians will always object to NATO's missile defense efforts since they can neither match them nor join them in any meaningful way. In the case of Iran, Russian officials genuinely perceive less of a threat from Tehran than do most Americans, and Russia has more to lose from a cessation of economic ties with Iran -- as well as from an Iranian-Western reconciliation. On the other hand, these conflicts can be managed, since they will likely remain limited and compartmentalized. Russia and the West do not have fundamentally conflicting vital interests of the kind countries would go to war over. And as the Cold War demonstrated, nuclear weapons are a great pacifier under such conditions. Another novel development is that Russia is much more integrated into the international economy and global society than the Soviet Union was, and Putin's popularity depends heavily on his economic track record. Beyond that, there are objective criteria, such as the smaller size of the Russian population and economy as well as the difficulty of controlling modern means of social communication, that will constrain whoever is in charge of Russia.

#### Russia relations are resilient-crises are fueled by domestic politics but never cause long term damage

Daragh McDowell, Oxford IR doctoral candidate, 8-22-2011, “Don't Sweat the Russia 'Reset'”, http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/9837/dont-sweat-the-russia-reset

In recent weeks, pundits, diplomats and assorted foreign policy wonks have started raising the alarm on U.S.-Russia relations, with the Obama administration's much-trumpeted "reset" seeming to be increasingly under threat. A recent travel ban by the U.S. State Department on certain Russian officials believed to be involved in the death of lawyer Sergei Magnitsky elicited an angry response from Moscow threatening cooperation in areas ranging from Afghanistan to North Korea. Russia's ambassador to NATO, Dmitry Rogozin, has started grousing about U.S. missile defense plans again. And all of this comes against a backdrop of increasing criticism from Prime Minister Vladimir Putin and his factional supporters in the Russian government about U.S. policy in Libya and Syria. Predictably, this has resulted in a stream of op-eds in the Western press raising the specter of a "new Cold War." So is the concern justified? In a word, no. There has been no major break in U.S.-Russian relations, nor is one likely. What we are seeing is yet another one of Russia's periodic succession crises in the run-up to next year's presidential election. As Russia is in functional terms a nondemocratic state, there is no effective and broadly accepted mechanism for ensuring an orderly transfer of power, and arguably there hasn't been one since the days of the tsar. The selection and installation of a new ruler tends to be a perilous affair for everyone involved. It also tends to make Russian foreign policy highly reactive and aggressive until the crisis passes. To understand why this is, we first need to examine how the Russian regime actually operates. Though the idea has taken hold in much of the Western press that the Russian state can be reduced to Putin, Russia's leadership is actually a collection of various elite interest groups, often referred to as "clans." The role of the national leader is to ensure a rough balance of power among the clans and to keep open conflict from breaking out. This presents an obvious problem when the time comes to change the national leader. Since the new leader must come from within the current elite, he or she will already be a member of an established clan. That raises the risk that the new boss will use his position to benefit his own clan rather than to maintain the balance of power among them all. As the stakes rise, nerves fray and intra-elite conflict becomes more likely. This leads to a more confrontational foreign policy for two key reasons. First, during a domestic crisis, the regime is at its weakest, and as a result it seeks to keep the influence of external actors to an absolute minimum by scaring them away. Think of a cat giving birth: It screeches and howls and spits to scare off other predators, all in an effort to hide the fact that it is momentarily powerless to defend itself. Similarly, during a succession crisis, the Russian Foreign Ministry makes alarming noises in order to put the West on the defensive while the Kremlin sorts out its internal affairs. But there is another and admittedly more worrying reason for this phenomenon. When the clans start to fight one another, there are few restrictions on either the site of battle or the weapons employed. For the siloviki clans -- members and former members of the security services -- in particular, political struggles are often a matter of life and death. Interfering with foreign policy can be a potent weapon: By creating a tense and even hostile international environment, clan members can tilt the scales in favor of conservatism, a hard-line leadership and preservation of the status quo. The last such crisis occurred in 2007, as Putin prepared to make way for President Dmitry Medvedev. At that time, a siloviki war broke out in Russia, leading to several mysterious deaths. Furthermore, the succession crisis is the most plausible explanation for the assassination of Alexander Litvinenko. By this argument, elements in the regime wanted to either display their capabilities for mischief-making to the various leadership contenders or else create a crisis that forced Putin to stay in a position of power. Why else would the Russian security services use polonium to kill Litvinenko, thereby leaving a radioactive trail leading right back to the Kremlin, when they have access to an array of lethal and nearly untraceable poisons? Luckily, the current impasse is more of a mini-crisis. The ruling tandem of Putin and Medvedev has managed to keep a fairly tight rein on power, and the smart money remains on Medvedev remaining as president with Putin continuing as prime minister. There is still an element of uncertainty though. The caricature of Medvedev as "Putin's puppet" has always been inaccurate, and as president Medvedev has gained leverage to push both a foreign and domestic agenda that has discomfited his political opponents. Many hardliners would dearly love to see Medvedev out and Putin back in as unrivaled leader of the Russian political elite. The next few months will therefore be rough ones for Russia's relations with the West. But when the dust settles and the official candidate -- and therefore winner -- of the 2012 presidential election becomes clear, things should settle down just as quickly as they have recently flared up. In the meantime, Europe and the U.S. should try to react as little as possible and avoid doing any lasting damage that can't be easily repaired

### US-Russia Relations Resilient

#### Relations are resilient – common interests check disagreements

Sherle R. Schwenninger, New America Foundation, The Nation, 10-6-2008, “Ten National Security Myths”

First, Russia’s foreign policy has not been anti-American. Moscow has cooperated with Washington on a number of important international issues, from assisting NATO against the Taliban in Afghanistan and supporting Washington’s counterterrorism efforts, to joining the coalition to curb Iran’s nuclear enrichment program. Second, what McCain sees as a pattern of intimidation to re-establish the Russian empire more objective analysts see as a great power protecting its legitimate interests in the face of US provocations. These provocations started during the Clinton administration and have increased under Bush, with the expansion of NATO to Russia’s border and abrogation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. They have continued with the promise of NATO membership to Georgia and Ukraine and the decision to deploy a missile defense system in Central Europe. Yet Moscow has responded for the most part in a measured and defensive way, its most forceful move being the recent military actions in Georgia to protect South Ossetia. When the Georgian president, Mikheil Saakashvili, sent forces into South Ossetia in violation of an earlier agreement, Russia responded much as the United States did when it intervened in 1999 against Serbia over Kosovo. Russian military actions in Georgia may have been disproportionate, but not as disproportionate as Washington’s extensive bombing of Serbia proper. Despite the souring of the earlier cooperative relationship with the Bush administration, Russia has made it clear that it would still prefer a strategic partnership that would reduce nuclear weapons, contain Islamist extremism, and expand the world’s oil and gas supplies. But it has also made it clear that this partnership must be based on mutual interests and compromise, not simply on Russian acquiescence in American dictates.

### Winners Win

#### Winners Win

Jonathan Singer, J.D. University of California @ Berkeley and editor of MyDD, 3-3-2009, “By Expending Capital, Obama Grows His Capital,” MyDD, http://mydd.com/story/2009/3/3/191825/0428

"What is amazing here is how much political capital Obama has spent in the first six weeks," said Democratic pollster Peter D. Hart, who conducted this survey with Republican pollster Bill McInturff. "And against that, he stands at the end of this six weeks with as much or more capital in the bank." Peter Hart gets at a key point. Some believe that political capital is finite, that it can be used up. To an extent that's true. But it's important to note, too, that political capital can be regenerated -- and, specifically, that when a President expends a great deal of capital on a measure that was difficult to enact and then succeeds, he can build up more capital. Indeed, that appears to be what is happening with Barack Obama, who went to the mat to pass the stimulus package out of the gate, got it passed despite near-unanimous opposition of the Republicans on Capitol Hill, and is being rewarded by the American public as a result. Take a look at the numbers. President Obama now has a 68 percent favorable rating in the NBC-WSJ poll, his highest ever showing in the survey. Nearly half of those surveyed (47 percent) view him very positively. Obama's Democratic Party earns a respectable 49 percent favorable rating. The Republican Party, however, is in the toilet, with its worst ever showing in the history of the NBC-WSJ poll, 26 percent favorable. On the question of blame for the partisanship in Washington, 56 percent place the onus on the Bush administration and another 41 percent place it on Congressional Republicans. Yet just 24 percent blame Congressional Democrats, and a mere 11 percent blame the Obama administration. So at this point, with President Obama seemingly benefiting from his ambitious actions and the Republicans sinking further and further as a result of their knee-jerked opposition to that agenda, there appears to be no reason not to push forward on anything from universal healthcare to energy reform to ending the war in Iraq.

#### Lame duck proves – nothing breeds success like success.

Gordon Robison, 12-29-2010, Special to Gulf News Obama returns to winning ways http://gulfnews.com/opinions/columnists/obama-returns-to-winning-ways-1.737442

Two months ago, in the immediate aftermath of the midterm elections, President Barack Obama and his administration were pronounced politically dead. Last week, Senator Lindsey Graham, a prominent South Carolina Republican, grumbled that the Democrats had spent December enacting one liberal agenda item after another despite protests from the GOP. This led the pundit class to spend the closing days of the year marvelling at Obama's political strength and prowess. In doing so they tended to ignore their own confident predictions of a few weeks earlier: the ones in which they had written off Obama as inept and ineffective. What changed? The short answer is winning. In America's hyper-competitive capital nothing succeeds like success. The Obama of November 3 was a politician who had just been clobbered at the polls. The Obama who jetted off to join his family in Hawaii for Christmas was a politician who had just closed out a string of wins on issues ranging from homosexuals in the military to a nuclear arms treaty with Russia, even as he put down a revolt in his own party led by liberals objecting to the president's compromise with Senate Republicans over taxes. If there is a single lesson for the president to take away from the last few weeks it is not to make the mistake of paying much attention to the praise: those in the media who are smitten by him today will go back to calling him incompetent and out of touch the moment something goes wrong, as it inevitably will.

### Winners Win

#### Wins build momentum

Jeff Mason, staff writer for Reuters, 3-26-2010, “Obama's health win could boost foreign policy,” http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE62P4H820100326

WASHINGTON (Reuters) - President Barack Obama's domestic success on healthcare reform may pay dividends abroad as the strengthened U.S. leader taps his momentum to take on international issues with allies and adversaries. More than a dozen foreign leaders have congratulated Obama on the new healthcare law in letters and phone calls, a sign of how much attention the fight for his top domestic policy priority received in capitals around the world. Analysts and administration officials were cautious about the bump Obama could get from such a win: Iran is not going to rethink its nuclear program and North Korea is not going to return to the negotiating table simply because more Americans will get health insurance in the coming years, they said. But the perception of increased clout, after a rocky first year that produced few major domestic or foreign policy victories, could generate momentum for Obama's agenda at home and in his talks on a host of issues abroad. "It helps him domestically and I also think it helps him internationally that he was able to win and get through a major piece of legislation," said Stephen Hadley, former national security adviser to Republican President George W. Bush. "It shows political strength, and that counts when dealing with foreign leaders." Obama's deputy national security adviser Ben Rhodes said the Democratic president's persistence in the long healthcare battle added credibility to his rhetoric on climate change, nuclear nonproliferation and other foreign policy goals. "It sends a very important message about President Obama as a leader," Rhodes told Reuters during an interview in his West Wing office. "The criticism has been: (He) sets big goals but doesn't close the deal. So, there's no more affirmative answer to that criticism than closing the biggest deal you have going."

### Political Capital Theory Wrong

#### Presidential leadership’s irrelevant

Lawrence Jacobs and Desmond King 10, University of Minnesota, Nuffield College, 8-2010 “Varieties of Obamaism: Structure, Agency, and the Obama Presidency,” Perspectives on Politics, 793-802

But personality is not a solid foundation for a persuasive explanation of presidential impact and the shortfalls or accomplishments of Obama's presidency. Modern presidents have brought divergent individual traits to their jobs and yet they have routinely failed to enact much of their agendas. Preeminent policy goals of Bill Clinton (health reform) and George W. Bush (Social Security privatization) met the same fate, though these presidents' personalities vary widely. And presidents like Jimmy Carter—whose personality traits have been criticized as ill-suited for effective leadership—enjoyed comparable or stronger success in Congress than presidents lauded for their personal knack for leadership—from Lyndon Johnson to Ronald Reagan.7 Indeed, a personalistic account provides little leverage for explaining the disparities in Obama's record—for example why he succeeded legislatively in restructuring health care and higher education, failed in other areas, and often accommodated stakeholders. Decades of rigorous research find that impersonal, structural forces offer the most compelling explanations for presidential impact.8 Quantitative research that compares legislative success and presidential personality finds no overall relationship.9 In his magisterial qualitative and historical study, Stephen Skowronek reveals that institutional dynamics and ideological commitments structure presidential choice and success in ways that trump the personal predilections of individual presidents.10 Findings point to the predominant influence on presidential legislative success of the ideological and partisan composition of Congress, entrenched interests, identities, and institutional design, and a constitutional order that invites multiple and competing lines of authority. The widespread presumption, then, that Obama's personal traits or leadership style account for the obstacles to his policy proposals is called into question by a generation of scholarship on the presidency. Indeed, the presumption is not simply problematic analytically, but practically as well. For the misdiagnosis of the source of presidential weakness may, paradoxically, induce failure by distracting the White House from strategies and tactics where presidents can make a difference. Following a meeting with Obama shortly after Brown's win, one Democratic senator lamented the White House's delusion that a presidential sales pitch will pass health reform—“Just declaring that he's still for it doesn't mean that it comes off life support.”11 Although Obama's re-engagement after the Brown victory did contribute to restarting reform, the senator's comment points to the importance of ideological and partisan coalitions in Congress, organizational combat, institutional roadblocks, and anticipated voter reactions. Presidential sales pitches go only so far.

#### 8% chance of the internal link

Matthew Beckmann and Vimal Kumar 11, Associate Professor of Political Science at UC Irvine, econ prof at the Indian Institute of Tech, “Opportunism in Polarization”, Presidential Studies Quarterly; Sep 2011; 41, 3

The final important piece in our theoretical model—presidents' political capital—also finds support in these analyses, though the results here are less reliable. Presidents operating under the specter of strong economy and high approval ratings get an important, albeit moderate, increase in their chances for prevailing on “key” Senate roll-call votes (b = .10, se = .06, p < .10). Figure 4 displays the substantive implications of these results in the context of polarization, showing that going from the lower third of political capital to the upper third increases presidents' chances for success by 8 percentage points (in a setting like 2008). Thus, political capital's impact does provide an important boost to presidents' success on Capitol Hill, but it is certainly not potent enough to overcome basic congressional realities. Political capital is just strong enough to put a presidential thumb on the congressional scales, which often will not matter, but can in close cases.

### Political Capital Theory Wrong

#### Wont spend PC

Jonathan Chait, staff writer, 12-29-2011, “Obama Hates Congress,” NYMag, nymag.com/daily/intel/2011/12/obama-hates-congress.html

There has always been a distinct chilliness between President Obama and official Washington. Even ideologically sympathetic Democrats in Congress tend to quietly, and sometimes not so quietly, complain that he is ignoring them. Helen Cooper reports today in the New York Times that there's a reason members of Congress feel that Obama ignores them — he hates them: More noteworthy than Mr. Obama’s spending the short flight calling his longtime aide is what he did not do: schmooze with Washington politicians. No one from the New Hampshire Congressional delegation traveled with Mr. Obama on the plane, a perk that presidents often offer to lawmakers to foster good will. Mr. Obama, in general, does not go out of his way to play the glad-handing, ego-stroking presidential role. While he does sometimes offer a ride on Air Force One to a senator or member of Congress, more often than not, he keeps Congress and official Washington at arm’s length, spending his down time with a small — and shrinking — inner circle of aides and old friends.

## Elections DA Answers

### No Obama – General

#### Obama will lose – EPA scandal

Chris Stirewalt, ed. @ Fox News, 4-26-2012, “Obama’s EPA Could Be Toxic to His Re-Election Hopes,” http://www.foxnews.com/politics/2012/04/26/obama-epa-could-be-toxic-to-his-re-election-hopes/

While the hot tub lovers at the General Services Administration have been surging of late and the Solyndra scandal makes the Department of Energy a contender, the agency doing the most damage to President Obama's re-election hopes still has to be the EPA. The latest political headache from the agency is a newly surfaced video from a 2010 conference starring Al Armendariz, whom Obama appointed in November 2009 as the regional director of the agency's Region Six, which covers Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas. In the video, Armendariz outlines his philosophy about enforcing environmental regulations on oil and gas producers in the region, acknowledging that it was "probably a little crude." "It was kind of like how the Romans used to conquer little villages in the Mediterranean," Armendariz said. "They'd go into a little Turkish town somewhere, they'd find the first five guys they saw and they'd crucify them. And then, you know, that town was really easy to manage for the next few years." Armendariz's suggestion was that the agency should "find people who are not complaint with the law, and you hit them as hard as you can and make examples out of them." (One tip for government officials: If you feel prompted to preface remarks by saying an analogy is "probably a little crude" you probably should stop talking, especially if your analogy has you playing the role of a Roman centurion torturing and killing defenseless, innocent villagers.) Sen. James Inhofe, R-Okla., the agency's leading critic in the Senate, got ahold of the video and on Wednesday launched a blistering speech on the Senate floor, quoting from it extensively. Media outlets quickly picked up on the video, which seemed to confirm conservative critics who claim that Obama's environmental enforcement has been capricious, heavy-handed and unfair. Armendariz acknowledged in a statement having made the speech and apologized to those offended and said he regretted his "poor choice of words" but claimed he has always practiced "fair and vigorous enforcement." An agency spokeswoman also indicated that the EPA was standing behind Armendariz. But congressional hearings and greater press scrutiny on his record can't be far off. If Armendariz thinks he regrets the statement now, just wait a week. Remember, all energy producers are in some ways out of compliance with EPA regulations. The regulatory process is just that - a process. The agency finds violations of phonebook-thick rules on drilling, mining, pumping, burning, storing and transporting of energy. The energy companies then offer remedies that the agency either accepts or rejects. Disputes often end up in federal administrative law courts. Sometimes there's a cut and dried case of an energy producer knowingly violating the rules and trying to cover it up, but most of the environmental offenses fall under a back-and-forth between the regulators and the regulated. Republicans say that the agency under Obama has gone from an agency that seeks to keep companies in compliance with environmental rules to one that is looking to bust companies and take scalps. With gasoline prices sky high and the EPA already very much in the news because of Republican charges that agency is pushing energy prices up, the last thing the president needs is to have one of his appointees on camera seeming to conform the charges of his Republican challenger, Mitt Romney. Environmental policy has been a constant source of aggravation throughout the Obama era. The president made combating global warming a central tenet of his 2008 campaign and he sought to deliver on his promises after taking office by pushing new federal fees on carbon emissions. House Democrats took up the cause with gusto, passing what supporters call "cap and trade" legislation. Senate Democrats demurred and left their House colleague dangling. While Obama's health law was the primary cause of the Democratic disaster in 2010, many losses, especially in the Rust Belt, can also be attributed to that global warming legislation. When the bill was still pending in the Senate, Obama tried to use the EPA as a threat to force carbon-state Democrats to the negotiating table. The threat was that if moderate Democrats didn't deal, Obama would cripple fossil fuels by allowing the EPA to regulate carbon dioxide, a common component of the atmosphere, as a toxic substance that endangers human health. Democrats called Obama's bluff and the administration shelved the regulations, which would have been crippling to U.S. industry and might have resulted in regular brown outs during periods of peak energy consumption. But since them, the EPA has been back on the march with a clutch of new rules that while less sweeping, add up to the same kind of global warming crackdown by other means. The agency has also taken up the issue of natural gas exploration, adding new restrictions on drilling even as the president calls for increased natural gas use as part of his effort to combat Republican complaints that he is driving energy prices higher by limiting access to domestic oil reserves. Obama knows that energy prices are one of his weakest weak spots against Romney. But he also knows that environmentalism is one of his best ways to keep liberals "fired up, ready to go." That's why in his recent interview with Rolling Stone magazine Obama promised that he would be "clear in voicing [his] that we're going to have to take further steps to deal with climate change in a serious way." But when pressed on what he would do to deal with the issue, Obama cited retrofitting buildings to be more energy efficient. While believers in global warming are making dire projections that large-scale development of new North American petroleum reserves would be "game over" for climate, Obama is talking about energy-efficient windows. Add in the political pain surrounding subsidies for Solyndra and other firms, and you see how the environment has become one of Obama's least favorite issues - and why Armendariz just joined that GSA guy in the hot tub as one of the president's least favorite bureaucrats.

### No Obama – General

#### Romney is winning – regression of polls

Steve Lombardo, CEO StrategyOne, 4-23-2012, “Election Monitor,” Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steve-lombardo/election-monitor-197-days\_b\_1445759.html

Mitt Romney may have rescued his fight for the nomination in Michigan with a narrow 3 point win on February 28th, but it was his nearly 12 point blow-out of Rick Santorum in Illinois on March 20th that probably ended the GOP nomination battle. What has gone unreported is that the President has been losing ground to Romney ever since that Illinois contest. So much so, that by the time Rick Santorum took to the podium on April 10th and announced he was suspending his campaign for the GOP nomination, Romney was moving close to near vote share parity with the President. In the 2 weeks since that announcement, we have had muddled but largely negative economic news, government scandals and an emergent Mitt Romney. While there will be plenty of twists and turns in this campaign, we may look back at the moments before Romney's big victory in Illinois as the high water mark of the Obama reelection campaign. Let's get straight to the head to head polling data and what we think it means. We took all public and private polling data since January of this year and plotted a regression trend line. Mitt Romney and Barack Obama began the year virtually tied, but Romney's net standing against the President eroded as the divisive primary season wore on. Romney reached his lowest ebb, trailing Obama by nearly six points, in early March -- but his subsequent success in knocking out Rick Santorum has also helped close the gap against the President. The two are again back to approximate parity. Obviously, at this point we are too far out to project, but the trend is in Romney's favor and he has had this momentum for 6 weeks.

#### Romney winning – scandals, economy, youth vote and independents

Steve Lombardo, CEO StrategyOne, 4-23-2012, “Election Monitor,” Huffington Post, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/steve-lombardo/election-monitor-197-days\_b\_1445759.html

The GSA and Secret Service scandals are taking a toll on the President's reelection three ways; 1) they send a signal to voters that the administration is not on top of things (further eroding their sense that the President's team is competent,) 2) it is a distraction that detracts from the White House messaging strategy and 3) it further erodes trust in public institutions at a time of extremely high political alienation. None of this is good for a President running for reelection. The economy continues to stagnate and this is hugely problematic for the White House. In our last edition, we noted some increasing signs of green shoots in the U.S. economy, particularly in the unemployment report. However, data released over the last month show a possible slowdown in this recovery already. Ongoing concerns about Europe, rising gas prices and a rise in new jobless claims are all troubling. A stalled recovery continues to be the biggest obstacle to Obama's reelection. Additionally, we are experiencing the same Spring slowdown that appears to be the new normal in housing markets that had appeared to hit bottom this winter. Student loans are another troubling sector, where debt continues to compound to all-time highs. This is not 1984. And it is not even close. For a while late last year and early this spring, some pundits suggested that the Obama recovery may look a lot like Reagan's. Wrong. As the charts below show, this economic recovery is staggeringly slow compared to the one nearly 30 years ago. For example, GDP growth the last two quarters of 1983 were 5 to 6 times greater than the same period in 2011. Similarly, job growth in the second half of 1983 was 2 to 3 times greater than in 2011. Enthusiasm for Obama may be receding among young voters. A recent Public Religion Institue/Georgetown University study found 18- to 24-year-olds do prefer Obama over a generic Republican, 48 percent to 41 percent. Still, this is a far different result than the 2008 election, where Obama did historically well among young voters, besting McCain 66 percent to 32 percent among 18- to 29-year-olds. Additionally, the favorability gap between Obama and Romney is closing: 52 percent of young adults in the survey had a favorable impression of Obama and 32 percent had a favorable impression of Romney. Note that horserace data for Obama vs. Romney isn't available from this survey fielded in March. President Obama lost Independents in 2010 and they have not come back. Like the last three elections, the key to this one will be Independents/swing voters. The President lost a sizable chunk of these voters with health care reform and a stagnant economy in late 2009. There is nothing in the data to suggest they are likely to move back to the President. For this reason, his overall approval rating remains stuck in the 44 to 48 percent range.

### No Obama – Election Thumpers

#### Oil, economy, and Romney thump Obama

Howard Gold, staff writer, 3-9-2012, “The President May Be Peaking Too Early,” The Independent Agenda, http://www.independentagenda.com/politics-and-2012-election/the-president-may-be-peaking-too-early/

President Obama has been on a roll of late. Unemployment has fallen steadily to 8.3%, and we’ve had 24 consecutive months—two years—of private sector job growth. The rate itself is much higher than previous presidents have faced going into re-election, but the trend is going his way. He and his political team have shrewdly exploited the divide between the pragmatic Republican leadership, which wants to defeat him in November, and Tea Party zealots who are just mad as hell at everything. The Republicans fell into the trap. Last summer’s debt ceiling fiasco was a huge negative for the GOP, and the president has boxed them in on several occasions since, especially over extensions of the payroll tax cut. And in their efforts to pander to a rabid element of their party, GOP presidential candidates have made one extreme statement after another on issues from immigration to Iran to birth control. That has driven up the negatives of all the candidates, including the frontrunner and likely nominee, former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney. So, the president’s approval rating hovers near 50%, its highest since last June. He leads Romney by nearly six percentage points in the polls. He enjoys wide support among Hispanics, women, and independents. And disaffected liberals have come home, as they always do. The president talks about the economy in his weekly radio address. White House Photo: Lawrence Johnson. But lots can happen between now and November. A European default is less likely, given the successful restructuring of Greece’s debt and European Central Bank president Mario Draghi’s pumping $1.5 trillion into the markets to stabilize banks. And the president may have bought some time with Israel by taking a strong rhetorical stand against Iran at his meetings with Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu this week. Iran’s Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khameini also made some noises about opening negotiations again on Iran’s nuclear program. That may ease oil and gasoline prices for a while. But they’re unlikely to drop dramatically unless there’s a clear, firm resolution under which Iran agrees not to continue its nuclear program under strict supervision. That’s unlikely, so gas prices are likely to stay high for months, which can be poisonous in an election year. Also, unemployment could rise again as discouraged jobseekers return to the market. That would open the president to stronger attacks against his economic stewardship, which could resonate with voters. And health care reform goes before the US Supreme Court this month, with a decision expected by July. If the Supreme Court declares the individual mandate unconstitutional, that would be a big blow to the president. Finally I just can’t believe Gov. Romney is going to remain this bad a candidate once the albatross of dealing with Republican primary voters is off his neck. His economic message may be pretty effective with voters come fall.

#### Israel strikes Iran – kills Obama

Andrew Sullivan, staff writer, 3-4-2012, “Obama at AIPAC,” Newsweek, http://andrewsullivan.thedailybeast.com/2012/03/obama-at-aipac.html

For the worldview of Cheney and Netanyahu to prevail, Obama must be defeated. That is clearly the agenda of the current Israeli government, and what the NYT delicately but accurately calls "Israel's backers" in the US. My worry is that once the Likudniks begin to realize Obama may not be defeated by the GOP at home, the current Israeli government would launch a war without warning to create a crisis to humiliate the president, rally end-times evangelicals to vote, send oil prices soaring, and force the US president to coopt a war he does not want and does not yet believe is necessary. If that helps the GOP nominee, so much the better. Every GOP candidate is now committed to the most extreme positions of the Likudnik Israeli right - and are to the bellicose right of most Israelis. I hope that the Israeli government is not that reckless or extreme. But ask yourself when thinking about Netanyahu: what would Cheney do? These individuals are radicals. They turned the US into a torturing nation and regarded that decision as a "no-brainer." A "wag-the-dog" scenario in which Netanyahu creates a war to wound and weaken a US president before an election is, sadly, not unthinkable. And he will have the GOP as his critical back-up.

### No Obama – Election Thumpers

#### Obama’s loss causes October surprise, or Obama will win because of an October surprise

Jeffrey T. Kuhner, staff writer at the Washington Times, 3-8-2012, “Obama's October surprise,” Times 24/7, Washington Times, http://times247.com/articles/obama-s-october-surprise

Is President Obama planning to launch military strikes against Iran in order to ensure re-election? Is there an October surprise being hatched by the White House? All the signals are: yes. Recently, Mr. Obama told an audience at the American Israel Public Affairs Committee’s annual policy conference in Washington, D.C., that a nuclear-armed Iran is “unacceptable.” He said that all options — including military force — are “on the table.” And he warned Tehran’s mullahs not to “call my bluff.” In short, the clouds of war are looming on the horizon. Yet, at the same time, Mr. Obama is strongly pressuring Israel not to attack Iran’s nuclear facilities. The administration argues that diplomacy, sanctions and covert operations are starting to take their toll on the Islamic Republic. Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has warned Mr. Obama that Jerusalem cannot wait much longer; Iran is about to enter the “zone of immunity” where it will acquire the capacity to build a nuclear weapon — crossing the threshold whereby the ayatollahs cannot be stopped from getting the bomb. Mr. Obama has assured Mr. Netanyahu not to worry; America will destroy Iran’s nuclear program if necessary. The president vowed at AIPAC that “I have Israel’s back.” He doesn’t. Mr. Obama is playing a cynical game, using the existential fate of the Jewish state as a political trump card to guarantee his re-election in November. He is the most anti-Israel president in U.S. history. Mr. Obama doggedly opposed the sanctions imposed on Iran — especially, on its central bank. The only reason he begrudgingly signed on was because they were embedded as part of the defense bill. Yet, he now claims credit for their impact. He has repeatedly called for diplomatic engagement with Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. In 2009, when pro-democracy protesters poured onto the streets of Tehran and other Iranian cities to protest the rigged elections, Mr. Obama did the unthinkable: He remained silent. He refused to lift a finger or say a word of encouragement to help the brave democrats seeking to overthrow the clerical fascist regime. Mr. Ahmadinejad is the Hitler of our time. He has repeatedly called for the destruction of Israel, pledging to wipe the Jewish state off the map. The Iranian strongman is a radical Shiite revolutionary, who hopes to erect a world Muslim empire on the ashes of the Jews. In short, he is not just the mortal enemy of Israel — and the West — but a genocidal madman. Mr. Obama’s dithering and feckless diplomacy has given the mullahs the one thing they desperately crave: time. They are running out the clock in order to achieve an Islamic bomb. Instead of stopping them, Mr. Obama has only emboldened their nuclear ambitions. Moreover, the administration has called for Israel to enter peace talks with the Palestinians based on a return to the pre-1967 borders. This would effectively force Jerusalem to accept territorial boundaries that would leave it defenseless against any future Palestinian or Arab invasion. Mr. Obama also withdrew support for Egypt’s pro-American dictator, Hosni Mubarak. The result is that the Muslim Brotherhood has come to power. Mr. Mubarak was many things — venal, corrupt and brutal. But he kept the peace with Israel and helped to advance America’s national interests in the region, especially, in fighting Islamic terrorists.This has now changed. The Muslim Brotherhood aims to forge a Sunni theocracy, transforming Egypt into an anti-Semitic, anti-Western hotbed. Hence, under Mr. Obama’s leadership, the Jewish people find themselves encircled by dangerous Islamists. Providing Mr. Obama with control over Israel’s future is like trusting Dracula with a blood bank. It is an act of folly. Mr. Obama refuses to give Israel the green light to launch military strikes on Iran. Israeli intelligence officials admit that, privately, the White House has warned Mr. Netanyahu that in the event of an attack Israel — not Iran — will be blamed by the administration. In short, Mr. Obama is trying to tie Mr. Netanyahu’s hands, coercing him to wait for Washington to take decisive action. The record, however, is clear: Sanctions have not — and will not — work. Russia and China continue to prop up Tehran. Moreover, the mullahs are not driven by economic considerations; a messianic theocracy is not concerned about growth rates or improving living standards. It cares about cementing its grip on power. A bomb will ensure the survival of the Islamic Republic. It will be untouchable. This is why a regional showdown is inevitable. Mr. Obama is blatantly attempting to maximize his political capital. He is hoping to keep the charade of diplomacy and sanctions going until the summer or early fall. And then, when he believes Iran is on the cusp of going nuclear, Mr. Obama will order an American — not Israeli — airstrike on Tehran’s key facilities. The result will be a temporary boost in his popular approval, as Americans rally around their commander-in-chief. It will make Mr. Obama look decisive, strong and presidential. It will propel him to victory, riding a wave of patriotic emotion. With gas prices surging, unemployment remaining high, Obamacare deeply unpopular, soaring deficits and a debt crisis looming, Mr. Obama cannot win in November. His record is abysmal. He has only one option: bomb Iran. The problem is that it may be too late. Mr. Ahmadinejad’s behavior is not being guided by our election schedule, but religious fanaticism. Israel should ignore Mr. Obama’s Machiavellian promises. He is interested only in power. The Jews are confronting something much more important — survival.

### No Obama – Euro Thumper

#### Eurozone collapse coming

Ezra Klein, staff writer, 2-6-2012, “Wonkbook: Obama's fresh lead remains vulnerable to Europe's woes,” Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/post/wonkbook-obamas-fresh-lead-remains-vulnerable-to-europes-woes/2012/02/06/gIQANzUbtQ\_blog.html

A European Union (EU) flag, left, and Greek national flag fly near the Parthenon temple. (Bloomberg) The latest Washington Post/ABC News poll shows President Obama's approval rating has risen to 50 percent and he's opened up a six-point lead against Mitt Romney. In part, that's because the primary is hurting Romney. A majority of Americans who are closely following the campaign say they disapprove of what they're hearing among the Republicans, and by 2 to 1, Americans say that the more they learn about Romney, the less they like him. But in part, that's because a rebounding economy is helping Obama. Which is why all eyes in the West Wing will be on Greece this week, where a deal that could keep Europe stable and the recovery going is in danger of falling apart. Remember when the question was simply "whether" Greece would default? Good times. Now the question is how Greece will default. And there are two options: "orderly" and "disorderly." Orderly isn't great, but at least the markets are expecting it. Disorderly, however, could be quite bad. Josef Ackermann, chief executive of Deutsche Bank, tells the FT it could open "a new Pandora's box" in the Eurozone crisis. And disorderly is starting to look likelier. The problem, put simply, is that "the Troika" -- the IMF, the EU, and the European Central Bank -- want more concessions than the Greek political system seems to be capable of making. They want the minimum wage cut by 25 percent. They want supplementary pensions cut by 35 percent. They want to close 100 state-run organizations that will cost thousands of jobs. And they want all this done voluntarily by the politicians in a country that has gone, in a few short years, from 7.5 percent unemployment to 18.8 percent unemployment. And if it's not done, the next bailout won't come through, and Greece's default will become disorderly -- with untold, but clearly disastrous, consequences for both Europe and the United States. So will it happen? A few weeks ago, the Peterson Institute for International Economics hosted a debate on the future of the Eurozone crisis. Simon Johnson and Peter Boone took the pessimistic side. They argued, persuasively, that the Eurozone authorities had continuously proven themselves unable to solve this crisis. They showed how each successive bailout and intervention had failed to arrest the market's panic for any extended period of time. They laid out the impossible math of a real solution, and the many, many tripwires that could unravel the whole thing. Their answer, in other words, was clear: Yes, Greece will fall apart. Or, if it's not Greece, it will be something else. And it will likely happen soon.

#### Kills Obama and the recovery

Ezra Klein, staff writer, 2-6-2012, “Wonkbook: Obama's fresh lead remains vulnerable to Europe's woes,” Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/ezra-klein/post/wonkbook-obamas-fresh-lead-remains-vulnerable-to-europes-woes/2012/02/06/gIQANzUbtQ\_blog.html

So the question as we look towards Greece's troubles today and the Eurozone over the next year is whether the rules governing the macro question -- whether the Eurozone will survive -- trump the rules governing the everyday panics and political decisions that imperil its survival. Or perhaps there's some theory that can bring them both together. The answer to this question, perhaps more than any other, will decide whether Obama's momentum continues, or fizzles out amidst a new economic crisis.

#### Europe collapse coming – kills Obama

Tom Raum, staff writer, 1-14-2012, “2012 wildcard: If Europe tanks, US economy could, too,” Salt Lake Tribune, http://www.sltrib.com/sltrib/world/53300969-68/europe-obama-european-economy.html.csp

And there’s the possibility that the German-French teamwork could falter. Sarkozy is trailing in polls heading toward a two-round presidential balloting on April 22 and May 6. The front-runner, Socialist Francois Hollande, has denounced the Sarkozy-Merkel plan now in place and has hinted he would walk away from it if elected. Merkel, too, is struggling to hold together her coalition. Merkel and Sarkozy also have differences over what role the European Central Bank should play and on a time schedule for introducing a tax on financial transactions in the 17 eurozone countries. Without the German-French partnership, the region could descend into turmoil. Many economists doubt the euro could survive under such circumstances. “It’s certainly possible” that a sharp worsening of the crisis could derail the U.S. recovery, said Nariman Behravest, chief economist at IHS Global Insight in Lexington, Mass. “The most likely scenario is Europe will sort of muddle through. But if there is a financial meltdown in Europe, then yes, it could drag down the U.S., both in terms of the stock market and the economy.” He puts the odds at “maybe 20 to 25 percent.” “I think Mr. Obama has more to worry about because if things go really badly, it will hurt his re-election chances. I’m not sure about the Republican contenders. A lot will depend on what they say and how they say it,” he said.

### No Obama – Health Care Thumper

#### Health Care ruling thumps the election

JANET ADAMY, JESS BRAVIN and ANNA WILDE MATHEWS, 3-28-2012, “Health Case Ripples Outward “, Wall Street Journal, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304177104577310050863533554.html

Under any outcome, the decision will wedge itself into the 2012 presidential election. White House officials said they remained confident the law would be upheld, and that it was impossible to predict the outcome. Ultimately, one official argued, the election is likely to turn on the economy, not health care, no matter what the ruling. Mr. Obama, who returned late Tuesday from South Korea, was briefed by staff on the court deliberations. Still, if all or part of the law is struck down, it would be a blow to Mr. Obama and Democrats, and create a liability months before the election. Republicans would hold up the victory as evidence the Obama administration overreached in trying to expand the scope of federal power. "To strike it down would send a chilling message to the administration's agenda," said Rep. Tim Scott (R., S.C.). Congressional leadership aides from both parties say a health law left with holes would have no chance of getting patched until at least after the election. What happens next would be largely driven by the election result. Republicans want to repeal the law, and Democrats have little incentive to restart work on a legislative fix, given how the law has thus far been a political loser. Lawyers for the Obama administration pressed the court on Wednesday for its preferred outcome, which would be to scrap certain popular insurance rules tied to the mandate, if the court was inclined to rule out the mandate.

#### Health Care ruling will break Obama

Jeffrey Toobin, senior legal analyst, 3-26-2012, “Court challenge holds high stakes for Obama,” CNN, http://www.cnn.com/2012/03/26/opinion/toobin-health-supreme/index.html?hpt=hp\_c

The Supreme Court can make or break presidencies. Almost a dozen years ago, five justices thrust George W. Bush into the Oval Office. A generation earlier, in United States v. Nixon, a unanimous court effectively ended the presidency of Richard M. Nixon by ordering him to provide the Watergate special prosecutor with the White House tapes. Now, to a great extent, the court will render a verdict on the current president's first term. The Supreme Court and election year blockbusters The stakes for Barack Obama can hardly be overstated, both substantively and politically. Health insurance for 30 million citizens hangs in the balance in this case. Obama took on the challenge that had defeated every Democratic president since Lyndon Johnson -- how to expand access to health care for millions of citizens who didn't have it. Obama won a brutal battle to get the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act through Congress, but it will matter little if the court invalidates the law. Obama is also, of course, a candidate for re-election, and a defeat in the Supreme Court would be a disaster for his chances to win again. If the court strikes down the law, the Republican candidate, presumably Mitt Romney, could say that the Supreme Court proved his own point -- that the incumbent is an out-of-the-mainstream liberal. And Romney could add that his own health care plan, for all its similarities to Obamacare, passed muster in the courts. For any president or any politician, losing is never good politics -- and a Supreme Court defeat would mark Obama as a loser in a significant and dramatic way.

#### Health care strikedown will hurt Obama

Steven Thomma, staff writer, 3-23-2012, “Obama's health care law remains huge political issue,” McClatchy, http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2012/03/23/142944/obamas-health-care-law-remains.html

WASHINGTON — It was the biggest achievement of his first term, the national health care law that had eluded Democrats for 60 years. "A big (bleep)ing deal," in the blunt words of Vice President Joe Biden. But it could help cost President Barack Obama a second term. Rather than cheering it on, Americans are divided over the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, which he signed into law two years ago Friday. The Supreme Court is weighing whether it's constitutional. Republicans vow to repeal it if the court doesn't. And the White House is working overtime to sell the American people on the law, before it's too late. It may still turn into a political triumph. Republicans, in fact, fear that if left intact, the law could take hold in the American psyche over the years, as Social Security and Medicare did generations ago. For now, though, it hangs in the political balance, along with the fate of Barack Obama.

### Economy Key To Election

#### Other factors cancel each other out – only the economy matters

Mano Singham, PHD, theoretical physicist and director of UCITE, at U Cleveland, 3-8-2012, “What really matters in predicting presidential election outcomes,” Free Thoughts Blog, http://freethoughtblogs.com/singham/2012/03/08/what-really-matters-in-predicting-presidential-election-outcomes/

A political scientist colleague of mine who tracks these things closely says that what they look at are markers of the state of the economy. The best predictor of presidential elections is the change in real disposable income and the GDP. Since there is usually a six-month lag in these numbers filtering down to voters, the figures that come in starting around May will give us a good indication of which way the election will go in November, largely irrespective of the candidates and the issues. Figures like unemployment do not matter so much because most people are employed and so it does not affect them directly. This seems counterintuitive. Surely the GRAGGS (guns, race, abortion, gays, god, sex) issues that occupy so much time and space and arouse so much passion must influence the way people vote? But apparently they are not very good as predictors. I am guessing here but suspect that it is because most people’s views on these are fixed and thus the debates have little chance of changing the way people vote and merely serve to stoke the intensity of their feelings. And for those who can be swayed, the effects are random and largely cancel each other out, in that for every undecided voter who decides to vote for the Democrat because he or she is disturbed by the contraception uproar, there is likely another who it drives to the Republican camp.

#### Econ’s the number one issue

Aaron Blake, staff writer, 1-25-2012, “Obama’s message: I’m back,” The Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/post/obamas-message-im-back/2012/01/24/gIQAQp56OQ\_blog.html

By pitching the country as back on the right track, Obama is essentially counting on progress for the rest of the year. The fact is, if things get worse than they are now, Republicans have video of Obama hailing the return of the country a scant nine months before the election. Immediately after Obama’s address, the GOP set about assuring the American people that his view was too rosy. “When President Obama claims that the state of our union is anything but grave, he must know in his heart that this is not true,” Indiana Gov. Mitch Daniels (R) said in the official Republican response. Daniels moved on to acknowledge that the economic hard times predated Obama’s tenure — a not-so-insignificant concession from the GOP — but argued that he has failed to pull the country out of the mess. “The president did not cause the economic and fiscal crises that continue in America tonight,” Daniels said. “But he was elected on a promise to fix them, and he cannot claim that the last three years have made things anything but worse.” This is truly the battleground of the 2012 presidential race. We can obsess over and over again about which GOP presidential candidate is electable and who has liabilities, but in the end, the perception of the economy is the No. 1 factor when it comes to ballots cast in November.

### Economy Key To Election

#### Econ determines the election

David Lauter, staff writer, 2-3-2012, “Jobs report a potential turning point in Obama's reelection year,” LA Times, http://www.latimes.com/news/politics/la-pn-obama-jobs-report-analysis-20120203,0,5801792.story

The election-deciding question now is likely to be whether the economy does, in fact, sustain its current growth rate. Obama and his aides have bitter experience on that score: Both of the past two years, economic growth perked up in the winter or early spring, only to collapse again in the summer. Europe's debt problems, rising gasoline prices and the continued loss of jobs in state and local governments, which shed a net of 14,000 positions even as the private sector expanded by 257,000, all have potential to derail the economy. Having been burned before, the president tried to walk a careful line this time around. "These numbers will go up and down in the coming months, and there's still far too many Americans who need a job, or need a job that pays better than the one they have now," he said during a speech in Virginia a few hours after the economic numbers were released. "But the economy is growing stronger. The recovery is speeding up." That caution is well advised, said Matt McDonald, a Republican economic strategist and adviser to John McCain in 2008. "It took them burning their hand on the stove three times, but they have learned not to touch that stove anymore," he said. "After so many false starts it's just going to take a while before people believe you. You want to be a cheerleader for the economy but you don't want to be Pollyanna." Even if growth continues, Obama still cannot count on a smooth road ahead. His reelection bid comes at a time of deep discontent among voters, with only one-in-four telling pollsters they see the country on the right track. "The country is now far too unhappy for any incumbent to be an odds-on favorite for re-election," said GOP strategist Mike Murphy. Moreover, voters' opinions about Obama are sharply polarized. Across 2011, an average of 80% of Democrats, but only 12% of Republicans, approved of Obama's job performance, according to Gallup polls. George W. Bush's ratings showed almost the same pattern, so that degree of partisan polarization has come to seem normal, but it was relatively rare in the 50 years before these two presidencies. With that partisan division in place, the vast majority of voters appear to have their minds made up about Obama: About 45% want to re-elect him and a similar number are determined not to. A dwindling number of voters in the middle will be targets for the vast resources the two parties plan to deploy in the months to come. For those voters, the behavior of the economy almost certainly will be the deciding factor. Indeed, political scientists have shown repeatedly that the factors over which journalists and political insiders obsess – TV ads, campaign strategies, get-out-the-vote efforts – affect presidential election outcomes only a little. Instead, in the absence of a divisive war or huge scandal, election results closely track the economics of the election year.

### Oil Key To Election

#### Gas prices are key – swings key states

Jim Efstathiou, staff writer, 3-8-2012, “Obama Faces Swing State Anger Over Gas Prices,” Bloomberg, http://www.businessweek.com/news/2012-03-08/obama-faces-swing-state-anger-over-gas-prices

Voters in some U.S. swing states are feeling the pinch of rising gasoline prices more than those in states that tend to vote Democrat, posing a challenge to President Barack Obama’s re-election, according to a report. Gasoline in Florida, Michigan, Nevada and Pennsylvania costs more than the national average of $3.76 a gallon, Trevor Houser, a partner at the New York-based policy analysis firm Rhodium Group, said yesterday in a report. Consumers in Iowa, New Mexico and Ohio spend more on gasoline as a percentage of their personal income than the national average. “If you look at those Midwest battleground states, those that haven’t crossed the line to $4 are pushing the limit,” Houser said in an interview. “Midwest battleground states will cross the threshold before the national average does. All things being equal, it’s bad for the incumbent.” Gasoline has emerged as an issue in the presidential election after prices rose 27 straight days through March 4. Mitt Romney, the former Massachusetts governor who is the leading contender for the Republican nomination, said Obama has slowed the growth of U.S. oil and gas production and should take some blame for rising energy costs. Former House Speaker Newt Gingrich, another Republican candidate for president, has said that Obama’s energy policies “exist in a fantasy world where we’re all going to end up buying an electric car.”

#### Gas prices kill Obama

Howard Gold, staff writer, 3-15-2012, “The President Needs to Deal With High Gas Prices,” The Independent Agenda, http://www.independentagenda.com/politics-and-2012-election/the-president-needs-to-deal-with-high-gas-prices/

Last week I wrote that President Obama may be peaking a bit too early in the election year. This week, several polls showed him slipping in popularity and tying or even trailing former Massachusetts Gov. Mitt Romney in the general election. There’s an obvious reason, and it’s not that voters are suddenly warming to the wretched Republican presidential candidates: Gasoline prices have continued to rise. As of Monday, a gallon of unleaded gasoline averaged $3.83 a gallon nationwide, up ten cents a gallon from two weeks ago. In California, it approached $4.50 a gallon, according to the US Energy Information Administration. The Wharton School put out a very helpful primer on gas prices, which you can read here. Three quarters of the price of gasoline are determined by the price of crude, and crude has been rising sharply amid speculation about an Israeli attack on Iran’s nuclear facilities or military action in the Strait of Hormuz, as I wrote in my column a couple of weeks ago. Some supply constraints at US refineries also are having an impact, and they may not be cleared up until June. That means we could have high gasoline prices through Memorial Day at least, which could have a chilling effect on the economy and hurt President Obama even more in the polls. Unfairly or not, a growing number of Americans now hold the president and his administration responsible for higher gasoline prices. So far the president hasn’t handled this well. While irresponsible candidates like former House Speaker Newt Gingrich pledge to get gasoline down to $2.50 a gallon (would that happen before or after he kept his promise to attack Iran?), the president himself has been shrugging his shoulders and saying there’s not much he can do about it. That is a reversion to the laid-back, it’s-out-of-my-hands style that hurt him during the debt ceiling debate when events seemed to be in charge of him rather than vice versa. Yes, the causes are complex and the problem is difficult to fix. And I don’t think cheap gas should be the be-all and end-all of our energy policy. But gasoline prices are a symbol of the president’s ability to take charge and solve economic problems that matter to real people. So, he needs to figure out how to relieve the bottlenecks at midcontinent storage facilities and help distributors get the crude to coastal refineries where they can be converted into gasoline.

### Oil Key To Election

#### Oil price shocks are coming – they kill Obama

Gary Dorsch, worked on the trading floor of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange for nine years as the chief Financial Futures Analyst for three clearing firms, 2-27-2012, “Global 'Oil Shock' Could Sink Obama's Re-Election Bid,” Safehaven, http://www.safehaven.com/article/24516/global-oil-shock-could-sink-obamas-re-election-bid

If Europe and the US continue to tighten economic sanctions on Iran, to a point of significantly wrecking havoc upon the Iranian economy, oil traders could seize any verbal threat by Tehran regarding the Strait of Hormuz, as a chance to jack-up oil prices. Some 40% of all seaborne oil passes through this narrow passageway, amounting to 17-million barrels per day.However, under international maritime law, Iran along with Oman has sovereign territorial rights over these waters. Iran has under United Nations law agreed to grant ‘innocent passage' to ships through its waters provided there is no infringement of its security. Although Tehran customarily follows the "Law of the Sea," it's not legally bound by them. The Iranian Regular Force Navy and the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Navy monitor and police the Strait of Hormuz, and could effectively shut down traffic for weeks until the US Navy could establish safe passage. Whatever the case, crude oil vigilantes can use the tension with Iran as a convenient excuse to bid-up the price of oil, and sustain the spike in gasoline prices. If correct, soaring gasoline prices could sink Obama's popularity and his re-election bid. "Oh what a tangled web we weave when first we practice to deceive,"-- Sir Walter Scott.

### AT: Tea Party Links

#### Tea party is irrelevant, they don’t support the GOP candidates

Brian Montopoli, senior political reporter, 12-2-2011, “Does the Tea Party still matter?” CBS News, http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544\_162-57335210-503544/does-the-tea-party-still-matter/

It's hard out there for a Tea Partier. A year after the Tea Party movement was credited with fundamentally transforming American politics - and helping the Republicans take control the House - it faces a 2012 presidential cycle without a candidate to call its own. The two leading contenders for the Republican presidential nomination, Mitt Romney and Newt Gingrich, have resumes that could make a Tea Partier's blood boil. Both backed the $700 billion TARP bank bailout in 2008 that Tea Parties rail against as emblematic of the corruption of American politics. (Gingrich initially opposed the measure before "reluctantly and sadly" backing it; Romney called it "the right thing to do.") Both have backed an individual mandate for health care coverage in the past, something Tea Partiers disdain as the prime example of big-government overreach. Gingrich is perhaps the consummate Washington insider. While the former House speaker has denied that he served as a lobbyist, he has been paid millions of dollars to broker influence in Washington, including on behalf of government-sponsored mortgage giant Freddie Mac, which many conservatives blame for the financial crisis. In 2003, he reportedly leaned on lawmakers to back the Medicare prescription drug benefit on behalf of the drug companies and industry lobbyists pouring money into his health care consulting firm. Romney's past moderation as Massachusetts governor, meanwhile, sets off alarm bells for Tea Partiers seeking ideological purity.

#### Tea party is focused on the Senate, not the White House

Brian Montopoli, senior political reporter, 12-2-2011, “Does the Tea Party still matter?” CBS News, http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544\_162-57335210-503544/does-the-tea-party-still-matter/

Brendan Steinhauser, Director of Federal and State Campaigns for Tea Party-aligned group FreedomWorks, said his group is focused on winning the Senate, not the White House. He acknowledged that the decision was not unrelated to the state of the GOP field. "If [Indiana Rep.] Mike Pence was running," he said, "I think it would be different." Duffy argued that the state of the presidential field suggests the appeal of the Tea Party movement is less broad than backers might like to think.

#### Tea party influence is way down

Brian Montopoli, senior political reporter, 12-2-2011, “Does the Tea Party still matter?” CBS News, http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544\_162-57335210-503544/does-the-tea-party-still-matter/

Participants display placards during a demonstration organized by the American Grass Roots Coalition and the Tea Party Express in Washington, D.C., March 16, 2010 in opposition to the health care reform bill. (Credit: Getty) "Maybe the lesson here is the Tea Party worked in certain states and certain primaries, but it's broader national appeal, even within the party, looks very limited if you base your judgments on the presidential race," she said. The 2012 cycle may well prove to be a crucial one for the Tea Party movement, which is trying to evolve and endure even as time - not to mention the "Occupy" movement - has left it with a diminished public profile. On Tuesday, the Pew Research Center released a survey showing that the percentage of Americans who say they agree with the Tea Party movement has fallen seven points in a year; while 20 percent now agree with the movement, 27 percent say they disagree.

### AT: Romney Bad – Russia/China Bashing

#### Romney wont tank relations – will shift to reconciliation

Eugene Ivanov, political commentator, 10-19-2011, “Mitt Romney: The no-apology candidate,” Russia Beyond the Headline, http://rbth.ru/articles/2011/10/19/mitt\_romney\_the\_no-apology\_candidate\_13598.html

It would be premature, however, to conclude that Romney’s current position vis-à-vis Russia, hostile as it may appear, will necessarily translate into explicit anti-Russian policies of his prospective presidency. Romney’s self-proclaimed status as the major Republican opponent to President Obama forces him to use every opportunity to criticize the Obama Administration. While criticizing the White House’s economic policies is easy given the status of U.S. economy, it’s much trickier to challenge Obama’s foreign policy. The fact is that in many respects, the Obama Administration’s current foreign policy discourse isn’t much different from that of his predecessor. And this poses a problem for Romney because his new “American Century” proposal is a slightly disguised version of the George W. Bush Administration’s “us-vs.-them” approach. Obama’s policy of “reset” in U.S.-Russia relations is perhaps the only area where Romney can see a clear deviation from the policies of the Bush era. Romney therefore attacks the “reset” because there is not much else to attack. It remains to be seen whether the newly acquired aggressive streak in Romney’s foreign policy views will eventually prevail, or if he will instead gradually return to the more pragmatic approach he adhered to in 2007. It remains to be seen, too, which effect Romney’s choice of Leon Aron – a prominent Russia expert from the American Enterprise Institute – as his Russia advisor will have on his presidential campaign. It may well happen that at certain point of his presidency, should it materialize, Romney will realize that having Russia as a partner serves American national interests better than having it as a foe. And who knows: Romney may decide to meet with Putin and look into his soul? And make no apology for that.

#### No risk Romney will bash China

David Rothkopf, staff writer, 11-15-2011, “10 Reasons Why Obama Will Win in 2012,” FP, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/11/15/10\_reasons\_why\_obama\_will\_win\_in\_2012

It is possible that some of the views that were offered by likely nominee Mitt Romney could be consequential. This would not seem to be good for U.S.-China relations except that there is virtually zero possibility that President Mitt Romney -- who would essentially be the hand-picked candidate of the business community and the major party presidential candidate with the closest ties to America's economic establishment in modern memory -- would actually follow through on his anti-Beijing saber-rattling once in office. Further, some of his statements were essentially meaningless to begin with -- like his assertion that a vote for him was the only way to avert Iran getting the bomb, not being backed by facts or even being remotely credible given how key what happens between now and when the next president takes office will be.

#### It’s all just campaign rhetoric – empirics prove no actual policies to back it up

Josh Gerstein, 11-22-2011, “The GOP's China syndrome”, Politico, http://www.politico.com/news/stories/1111/68952.html

Still, the strident anti-China tone in the GOP primary doesn’t seem to have rattled the Chinese as much as in the past, said Orville Schell of the Asia Society. “Initially, the Chinese were very offended by these statements, but over the last few years they’ve acquired a more sophisticated knowledge about the almost craziness that comes over a country during the campaign. They’re beginning to understand they should not react to everything. … Things usually settle down afterwards,” Schell said. The track record from recent U.S. campaigns underscores the wisdom of taking anti-China rhetoric with a large grain of salt. In 1980, candidate Ronald Reagan promised to reject limits on arms sales to Taiwan. Two years later, in deference to China, he agreed to rein in such sales. n 1992, a few years after China’s deadly suppression of protests in Tiananmen Square, candidate Bill Clinton’s campaign blasted President George H. W. Bush for coddling the “butchers of Beijing” and giving most-favored-nation trading status to “Chinese communists who deny their people’s basic rights.” Yet, within months of taking office, Clinton extended China’s trade status. And in 2008, presidential candidate Hillary Clinton, citing human rights concerns, called on President George W. Bush to boycott the first Olympics ever held in Beijing. (Bush went anyway.) A year later, Clinton headed to Beijing as secretary of state with a conciliatory message seen as downplaying human rights concerns. As senators and presidential candidates, Obama and Clinton also co-sponsored legislation to put duties on Chinese goods if China didn’t allow its currency to appreciate. As executive branch officials they’ve done nothing to move towards punishing Beijing over the currency issue. “When you really begin to govern, I don’t think the position has ever been as strong as during the campaign,” said Larry Wortzel, a Republican appointee to the U.S. Congressional-Executive Commission on China. “That has never panned out in terms of hard policy.” Wortzel, a longtime China hawk, said he expects this year’s set of rhetorical salvos at Beijing to be a bit more intense but basically to follow the same pattern. “China, writ large, has a huge target on its back in the campaign [but] there is such a disconnect between rhetoric and between action,” Wortzel. The discrepancies between what candidates say about China and how they’ve dealt with China aren’t particularly surprising given the way the U.S. as a whole is simultaneously dependent on China and acutely wary of its rise. “The country as a whole is schizophrenic when it comes to China policy,”

### AT: Romney Bad – Health Care

#### Won’t try to repeal – only tweak

Drew Armstrong, staff writer, 10-27-2011, “Repeal Obamacare? Good Luck,” BusinessWeek, http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/repeal-obamacare-good-luck-10272011.html

In a September Bloomberg poll, almost half of voters—48 percent—said the law may need small modifications but should remain in place. A little more than a third said it should be repealed, and 12 percent said it should be left alone. Laszewski predicts that a Republican President would end up trying to tweak and change the health law to make it work better, rather than repealing it. “To fix the health-care law and create something the majority of the country can be happy with, you really need bipartisan agreement,” he says. “One side rammed it through, and if the other side tries to ram it back the other way, you create as many problems.” The bottom line: “Repealing Obamacare” will be harder than Republicans let on: Even Americans who say they don’t like the law want to preserve much of it.

#### Can’t repeal – filibuster

Drew Armstrong, staff writer, 10-27-2011, “Repeal Obamacare? Good Luck,” BusinessWeek, http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/repeal-obamacare-good-luck-10272011.html

On day two of his Presidency, Romney says, he will push to repeal the health-care law. Yet taking the statutes off the books would require an act of Congress, including 60 of the 100 votes in the Senate (the number needed to overcome a certain filibuster), a hurdle that would be virtually impossible to meet unless the GOP wins an overwhelming Senate upset in the election. At the moment, Democrats and their allies control the chamber 53-47.

#### Won’t get enough votes for reconciliation

Drew Armstrong, staff writer, 10-27-2011, “Repeal Obamacare? Good Luck,” BusinessWeek, http://www.businessweek.com/magazine/repeal-obamacare-good-luck-10272011.html

So Romney says he will resort to using a fast-track rule in the Senate—the same parliamentary trick Democrats employed to pass part of the health-care law—that would allow Republicans to undo it piece by piece with a simple majority vote. In this way they could strip funding for the parts they don’t like. “You can effectively get rid of a good chunk of the law,” Chen says. Using such a parliamentary move, known as reconciliation, Congress could gut the law by eliminating the penalties for not having insurance and removing the $504 billion in subsidies the law offers to help people buy coverage. Republicans would still need a majority in the Senate to make that happen—unless GOP leaders can persuade enough Democrats to vote with them. That would be a tough sell, given wide support for the law within the party. And there is no way for Republicans to get rid of the “chunks” of the law they don’t like without effectively destroying the parts Americans overwhelmingly say they do like, including requirements that insurers cover people with preexisting conditions and allow young people to stay on their parents’ plans until age 26. Both are popular even among those who say they take issue with other parts of the law. Remove the requirement to buy insurance and reduce the number of healthy people who are covered under the law, and these perks become prohibitively expensive.’

### AT: Romney Bad – Iran Strikes

#### Romney won’t actually attack Iran

Thomas McAdams Deford, 11-16-2011, “Iran, the Bomb, and Mitt Romney,” Free Press, http://freepressonline.com/main.asp?SectionID=50&SubSectionID=72&ArticleID=16176

And it would leave Israel, the assumed beneficiary in such a confrontation, more isolated than ever; indeed, once Americans realized the damage an Israeli-inspired military action had inflicted on our own interests, American support for Israel would seriously weaken. One wonders, as we survey the damage of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan that the last Republican president launched - and the damage they have done to our economy and our international standing - whether Romney really would carry through on his pandering threat to attack Iran. We know he'll say anything to be elected president. But if elected, would he actually do as he says? Probably not - surely, he's not that stupid - but it's not a risk worth taking.

#### US will never strike Iran – prefers containment

Ali Younes, defense analyst, 8-5-2010, “Why the United States Will Not Strike Iran Now,” Palestine Chronicle, http://palestinechronicle.com/view\_article\_details.php?id=16180

The reasons that there will be no US war or military strike against Iran, in the near future, and under the current political environment, are that the US military command, under the guidance of its political leadership, is implementing a strategy of “deterrence” to prevent Iran from continuing its nuclear program. This strategy is based on the latest US military concept of “Joint Operations” which was released on 15 January 2009. The key question here, moreover, is what will be the purpose of a military strike against Iran? Will it end the Iranian nuclear program forever, or delay it by few years then eventually and perhaps go for regime change similar to the Iraqi scenario. Such options will not bring about, if not impossible, the desired change the US and Israel wants in Iran. The only option remains is “convincing” the Iranian leadership that its nuclear program is not in its best interests. Iran, however, is also developing its own counterstrategy of “convincing” and “Deterrence” against the US and Israel, by having its own forward operating bases in the Levant, Iraq and Afghanistan. Such bases and influence can serve Iran politically and military should the US and or Israel decides to attack Iran.

#### US will deter Iran, not attack

Ali Younes, defense analyst, 8-5-2010, “Why the United States Will Not Strike Iran Now,” Palestine Chronicle, http://palestinechronicle.com/view\_article\_details.php?id=16180

Biden and the US military commanders “threatening” statements against Iran, including using the Israeli power as leverage, were designed, in accordance with Capstone, to “convincing those adversaries [Iran] that a contemplated action [its military nuclear program] will not achieve the desired results, that the cost of such action will be too great, or that an acceptable situation can be achieved without it—or some combination of the three.” In other words, the current US strategy aims to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapons program through deterrence in the form of economic and military sanctions and by convincing the Iranian leadership by way of influencing their thinking (psychologically) that the costs are too great for them should they choose to continue with their nuclear program. The Iranian leadership will be influenced to think, as part of the “Deterrence” concept, that should they relent and abandon their nuclear ambitions, “an acceptable situation can be achieved without it.”

## Federalism DA Answers

### Not unique – Decline of federalism inevitable

#### Decline of federalism inevitable – no public support.

Lino A. Graglia, Professor of Law, University of Texas School of Law, Spring 2008, “Lopez, Morrison, and Raich: Federalism in the Rehnquist Court,” Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy, p.788

Even if the Court could find a principled way to limit Congress's legislative authority, it should not strain to do so. It now appears that a national government of limited legislative authority is neither a workable arrangement, nor what the American public actually wants. Federalism remains an American ideal favored by everyone in principle, but defended by practically no one when it presents an obstacle to national action to further some favored interest. President Reagan, for example, although an ardent supporter of federalism in principle, signed a federal statute requiring states to impose a minimum drinking age of twenty-one years or lose a portion of their federal highway funds. Highway safety, President Reagan believed, was more important than federalism. This easy trumping of federalism reflects the view of most congressmen and most people that, as a practical matter, Congress can and should be able to address any problem. The people apparently approved of the New Deal's massive centralization of legislative authority by reelecting President Roosevelt three times. The Hurricane Katrina disaster that struck New Orleans seemed to produce an almost uniform reaction that the federal government, not Louisiana, should have done more, and acted more quickly.

#### Court can’t effectively preserve federalism.

Lino A. Graglia, Professor of Law, University of Texas School of Law, Spring 2008, “Lopez, Morrison, and Raich: Federalism in the Rehnquist Court,” Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy, pp.788-789

Another reason that the Court should explicitly withdraw from Commerce Clause review is its inability to limit the power of the federal government, even when it consistently tries to do so. One could not expect the Court, an arm of the federal government, to limit the power of the federal government in order to protect the power of the States; the umpire is a member of one of the teams. Throughout its history, the Court's decisions have served more to validate than to restrict federal power. The Court's most important decision to that effect was probably the Lottery Case, which upheld a federal statute that sought to suppress gambling by prohibiting the interstate shipment of lottery tickets. The issue was important and difficult enough to warrant argument three times before the matter was decided by a five-to-four vote.

#### Court attempts to preserve federalism fail – not even Lopez could alter balance of power.

Lino A. Graglia, Professor of Law, University of Texas School of Law, Spring 2008, “Lopez, Morrison, and Raich: Federalism in the Rehnquist Court,” Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy, pp.790-791

From 1937 to 1995, judicial review of Congress's power under the Commerce Clause was fictional review, a virtually automatic rubberstamping of the challenged statute. Despite Lopez and Morrison, this reality, as Raich indicates, is not likely to change significantly. The result is the worst of all possible worlds. Congress excuses itself from paying serious attention to the constitutional question of the scope of its commerce power, instead insisting that dealing with such questions is the job of the Supreme Court. The Court, applying the rational basis test that it reinstated in Raich, then defers to a congressional judgment of constitutionality that Congress never made and hardly even considered relevant. All putative Commerce Clause legislation, then, is validated by the two-part formula providing that the commerce power is "plenary" and that Congress had a "rational basis" for determining that the regulated activity affects interstate commerce. The principle of federalism is lost in the shuffle.

### No link – Infrastructure is federal issue 1/2

#### No link – transportation falls within federal jurisdiction – commerce clause.

Charles J. Cooper and Brian Stuart Koukoutchos, Founding Partner, Cooper & Kirk, P.L.L.C. and former Visiting Professor of Constitutional Law, Haverford College, Spring 2008, “Federalism and the Telephone,” Journal on Telecommunications & High Technology Law, pp.296-297

Although these themes may seem familiar enough when considered in isolation, which is the norm, here we will consider them together. Recent telecommunications scholarship is wanting because it treats these economic and legal developments as isolated and unrelated phenomena: for example, articles on issues of federalism in telecommunications regulation ignore the impact of intermodal competition, while articles discussing the rise of intermodal competition proceed without consideration of the defining importance of federalism. Even those commentators who do discuss federalism's role in telecom regulation often offer oversimplified, ahistorical notions of federalism. "Federalism" cannot be facilely equated with blanket deference to state authority and autonomy. On the contrary, when it comes to the regulation of truly interstate commercial networks - be they networks of transportation (such as steamships and airlines), distribution (such as electricity and natural gas), or communication (such as wireline telephony and the Internet) - the central point of the Constitution, and in particular its Commerce Clause, was to lodge power in the national rather than the several state governments.

#### No state control over transportation – cooperative federalism disproves the link

Alexandra B. Klass, Professor of Law, University of Minnesota Law School, 2010, “State Standards for Nationwide Products Revisited,” Harvard Environmental Law Review, pp.356-357

Scholars have noted that until the New Deal, the idea of "dual federalism" was the "dominant judicial conception of the relationship of the states and the national government." Dual federalism was based on the idea that "the states and the federal government exercised exclusive control over non-overlapping regions of authority" (such as national security on the federal side and land use control on the state side), and that it was up to the courts to define and monitor these exclusive spheres of federal and state control. Since the rise of the federal regulatory state, however, many argue that the lines between federal and state authority have become mostly blurred, with the federal government and the states engaging in overlapping regulation of a wide range of subjects including education, public health and safety, transportation, and environmental protection. In recent years, there has been significant scholarly work documenting and theorizing this new brand of federalism, using labels such as "polyphonic federalism," "dynamic federalism," "empowerment federalism," "cooperative federalism," and "interactive federalism." While these labels describe concepts of federalism that are not identical, they all describe a situation where federal and state regulation are no longer separate spheres but instead exist as independent, but interacting, sources of authority. Such concurrent federal and state regulation results in a regulatory regime superior to what could be achieved by the independent activity of either one. The benefits that flow from this new type of federalism include plurality, dialogue, positive redundancy, greater regulatory competition, policy innovation, and resistance to monopolization and group capture.

### No link – Infrastructure is federal issue 2/2

#### Links outdated – federal government already involved in transportation infrastructure

Robert Jay Dilger, Senior Specialist in American National Government, 1-5-2010, “Federalism Issues in Surface Transportation Policy: Past and Present,” Congressional Research Service, http://assets.opencrs.com/rpts/R40431\_20100105.pdf

American federalism, which shapes the roles, responsibilities, and interactions among and between the federal government, the states, and local governments, is continuously evolving, adapting to changes in American society and American political institutions. The nature of federalism relationships in surface transportation policy has also evolved over time, with the federal government’s role becoming increasingly influential, especially since the Federal-Aid to Highway Act of 1956 which authorized the interstate highway system. In recent years, state and local government officials, through their public interest groups (especially the National Governors Association, National Conference of State Legislatures, National Association of Counties, National League of Cities, U.S. Conference of Mayors, and American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials) have lobbied for increased federal assistance for surface transportation grants and increased flexibility in the use of those funds. They contend that they are better able to identify surface transportation needs in their states than federal officials and are capable of administering federal grant funds with relatively minimal federal oversight. They also argue that states have a long history of learning from one another. In their view, providing states flexibility in the use of federal funds results in better surface transportation policy because it enables states to experiment with innovative solutions to surface transportation problems and then share their experiences with other states. Others argue that the federal government has a responsibility to ensure that federal funds are used in the most efficient and effective manner possible to promote the national interest in expanding national economic growth and protecting the environment. In their view, providing states increased flexibility in the use of federal funds diminishes the federal government’s ability to ensure that national needs are met. Still others have argued for a fundamental restructuring of federal and state government responsibilities in surface transportation policy, with some responsibilities devolved to states and others remaining with the federal government.

### No link – states can say no

#### No link – states can refuse federal funding or conditions – preserves federalism.

Brian Galle, Assistant Professor, Florida State University College of Law, October 2008, “Federal Grants, State Decisions,” Boston University Law Review, pp.880-881

In other words, courts and scholars generally believe that state officials will not turn down federal grants on their own in order to preserve a diverse national market for legal rules. Indeed, even scholars who generally are not sympathetic to arguments for judicial enforcement of federalism values appear to accept this claim. These other scholars, most prominently Professor Tribe, support the clear statement rule. [27](http://www.lexis.com/research/retrieve?cc=&pushme=1&tmpFBSel=all&totaldocs=&taggedDocs=&toggleValue=&numDocsChked=0&prefFBSel=0&delformat=VKWIC&fpDocs=&fpNodeId=&fpCiteReq=&expNewLead=id%3D%22expandedNewLead%22&fpSetup=0&brand=ldc&_m=8c480c3731d5d9cb371192cce1d2dcc3&newStartCite=1&crnCh=0&crnCt=ALLCASES&docnum=11&_fmtstr=FULL&_startdoc=1&wchp=dGLbVzk-zSkAW&_md5=a12e61ca3ef8d0624fa8fcf6e06419b7&focBudTerms=federalism+or+federalist+or+states+rights+w%2F20+transportation+or+highway&focBudSel=all" \l "n27" \t "_self) They argue that binding states by the terms of grant conditions arguably unclear at the time of acceptance will make it more difficult for voters to police offers and acceptances. Further, granting final say over grant terms to courts is said to diminish states' continuing political influence over those terms. As I attempt to show, these claims assume defects in the process of state decisions. The voter activism story presumes that officials imperfectly protect federalism concerns absent close monitoring by the public. And, absent some story about procedural flaws in state decision-making, it is hard to see how the state-political-influence account explains why states should in effect be forbidden to assume the risk that in the future they will enjoy diminished influence over federal law. My central argument here is that the available economic data belie, or at best do not support the claims that state officials will fail to preserve diversity, or that federal grants wrongly obscure official accountability. As a result, I maintain that decisions applying the clear statement rule, as well as more direct limits on conditional spending, are hard to defend. I examine the public finance literature on state and local fiscal health, and state and local official responses to grants from higher-level governments. I find, among other significant information, that critics of unconstrained conditional spending seem to greatly underestimate the capacity of state and local governments to raise their own revenues. In many cases the perceived political cost to officials of raising money locally will be less than the perceived cost of federal grant conditions, even if officials heavily discount those conditions. In those situations, the officials will refuse the grant unless there is an increase in its perceived benefits. In effect, states own-revenue capacity is an independent check on federal expansion by means of conditional spending. Relatedly, critics overlook the indirect fiscal supports (and, therefore, indirect constraints on Congress's power to utilize conditional spending) that flow to states through the federal tax system.

#### State officials overvalue federalism – creates incentives to turn down federal funds

Brian Galle, Assistant Professor, Florida State University College of Law, October 2008, “Federal Grants, State Decisions,” Boston University Law Review, p.918

To sum up, public choice analysis indeed predicts, as critics of conditional spending maintain and as Justice O'Connor claimed in New York v. United States, that state officials may not fully take into account the national interest in federalism when considering offers from Congress. However, a more complete survey of the political factors at work suggests that the question is complicated. There are significant reasons to doubt whether Justice O'Connor's generalization about the breadth and depth of the benefits and burdens of grants is correct. Perhaps more significantly, state officials have very powerful incentives to resist uniformity, even against the temptation of funds they need not impose taxes to obtain. While I know of no good metric for determining how much a state official "discounts" the federalism costs of accepting a grant, it would be very surprising if diversity is not prized by those officials at least as highly as the welfare benefits it creates.

#### Independent funding mechanisms preserve state authority.

Brian Galle, Assistant Professor, Florida State University College of Law, October 2008, “Federal Grants, State Decisions,” Boston University Law Review, pp.934-935

In sum, my analysis here suggests there is little justification for the clear statement rule. The rule, like other forms of constitutional enforcement, displaces the expressed preferences of political actors, including both federal grant-offerors and state and local grant-acceptors. Any analysis of the clear statement rule, including Professor Tribe's political-process story, must account for that fact by pointing to some flaw in the decisions officials make in offering and accepting grants that might justify federal judicial intervention. Yet, there is no real evidence that state decisions to accept funds fail to preserve the values that federalism protects, even if that is not what in fact motivates the state officials. Officials have their own reasons for preserving diversity. The perceived discount on raising funds locally often counter-balances the costs of accepting federal money. And there is little evidence that state officials perceive difficulty in raising funds through their own tax systems, especially in light of other federal tax supports, such as the federal deductibility of many state and local taxes.

### No modeling

#### Their evidence is outdated – other countries no longer model the US.

Andrew Moravcsik, Professor of Politics and Director of the European Union Program at Princeton University, 1/21/2005, “Dream On, America,” Newsweek, http://www.newsweek.com/id/48071/page/2

So it is elsewhere. After American planes and bombs freed the country, Kosovo opted for a European constitution. Drafting a post-apartheid constitution, South Africa rejected American-style federalism in favor of a German model, which leaders deemed appropriate for the social-welfare state they hoped to construct. Now fledgling African democracies look to South Africa as their inspiration, says John Stremlau, a former U.S. State Department official who currently heads the international relations department at the University of Witwatersrand in Johannesburg: "We can't rely on the Americans." The new democracies are looking for a constitution written in modern times and reflecting their progressive concerns about racial and social equality, he explains. "To borrow Lincoln's phrase, South Africa is now Africa's 'last great hope'." Much in American law and society troubles the world these days. Nearly all countries reject the United States' right to bear arms as a quirky and dangerous anachronism. They abhor the death penalty and demand broader privacy protections. Above all, once most foreign systems reach a reasonable level of affluence, they follow the Europeans in treating the provision of adequate social welfare is a basic right. All this, says Bruce Ackerman at Yale University Law School, contributes to the growing sense that American law, once the world standard, has become "provincial." The United States' refusal to apply the Geneva Conventions to certain terrorist suspects, to ratify global human-rights treaties such as the innocuous Convention on the Rights of the Child or to endorse the International Criminal Court (coupled with the abuses at Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo) only reinforces the conviction that America's Constitution and legal system are out of step with the rest of the world.

#### US model not key to the spread of federalism – Russia proves.

Victoria Schwartz, Associate at O'Melveny and Myers LLP and J.D. from Harvard Law School, Winter 2009, “The Influences of the West on the 1993 Russian Constitution,” Hastings International and Comparative Law Review, p.138.

Aside from political considerations, the Russians had a variety of Western models from which to choose. The drafters of the American constitution had no working models regarding federalism, and therefore paid very little attention to the theoretical aspects of the task. By contrast, post-communist nations such as Russia had extensive Western theory and practice to scrutinize as they determined what sort of federalism they wished to create.

#### New democracies have not emulated the US system.

Donald Horowitz, Professor of Law at Duke University, Summer 2007, “The Many Uses of Federalism,” Drake Law Review, pp.956-957.

Almost all large states that are governed democratically are federations. Nevertheless, twenty-four is not an impressive number, and all but four of the twenty-four listed federations antedate the Third Wave of Democratization. Most new democracies have not found federalism attractive, presumably because they fear that creating locally controlled federal units may encourage separatism and secession.

### No Spillover 1/2

#### No spillover - issue-specific politics prevent precedents from applying to other transportation issues.

Robert Jay Dilger, Senior Specialist in American National Government, 1-5-2010, “Federalism Issues in Surface Transportation Policy: Past and Present,” Congressional Research Service, <http://assets.opencrs.com/rpts/R40431_20100105.pdf>

Congress has debated the federal role in surface transportation policy since the nation’s formation in 1789. A review of the historical record suggests that the debate over the federal role in surface transportation policy has been influenced by factors both internal and external to the institution. Internally, the background, personalities, and ideological preferences of congressional leaders such as Senator Harry Byrd, Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, and Representative E. G. “Bud” Shuster have had a profound impact on the development of federal-state-local government relationships in surface transportation policy over time. The norms, customs, and traditions of the House and Senate have also had an influence. For example, the decentralized nature of decisionmaking in both the House and the Senate has compartmentalized decisions into more manageable pieces, but, arguably, has made it more difficult for Congress to develop broad-based policies that cut across committee jurisdictions or to enact proposals to consolidate programs or devolve programmatic authority to states as these actions might upset existing power relationships and require the consent of several committees and committee chairs. For example, in the House of Representatives, programmatic and funding distribution issues are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, but tax and Highway Trust Fund issues are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means. In the Senate, most programmatic and funding distribution issues are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Environment and Public Works for highways and other aspects of Title 23, but are under the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs for transit. Tax and Highway Trust Fund issues are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Finance. In the Senate, most safety issues are under the jurisdiction of either the Committee on Environment and Public Works or the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. The size of the 75-member House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure may also have an impact on federal-state-local relationships in surface transportation policy as each Member has a natural tendency to attempt to maximize surface transportation resources for their home district. Arguably, the committee’s unusually large size could make it more difficult to eliminate congressional earmarks or to achieve committee approval for program consolidations or devolution of programmatic authority because such changes are often viewed as jeopardizing existing funding streams and the ability of Members to claim and receive credit for helping their constituents.

#### Slippery slope is a myth.

Mark A. Hall, Professor of Law and Public Health, Wake Forest University, June 2011, “The New American Health Care System,” University of Pennsylvania Law Review, p.1840

How tightly the courts should police the commerce power depends in part on the risk of abuse. Any government power can be taken to the extreme, and opponents of particular measures are never short on outlandish hypothetical extensions. Two centuries ago, defenders of states' rights worried that the federal power "to establish ... post roads" could be abused to allow federal takeover of state highways, so they argued for limiting federal authority to only the designation of existing roads for postal routes, rather than the construction of new roads. Today, should we take any more seriously the speculation that upholding the individual mandate could permit a federal requirement to, for instance, own a General Motors car? One could equally worry that Michigan might do the same under its general police power. Noting ridiculous possibilities like these has seldom been enough in and of itself to preclude otherwise lawful exercises of the full extent of well-justified government powers. But that begs the question of how well-justified the individual mandate is. Therefore, I return to this slippery slope concern at the end of this Article, after more fully reviewing the extent of federal authority under the Necessary and Proper Clause.

### No Spillover 2/2

#### Other limits check federal power.

Mark A. Hall, Professor of Law and Public Health, Wake Forest University, June 2011, “The New American Health Care System,” University of Pennsylvania Law Review, pp.1865-1866

Beyond this noneconomic limit, a long list of other, express constitutional provisions limit even the most expansive federal powers. Comprehensive authority to regulate national markets still does not allow Congress to force people to eat (rather than merely purchase) broccoli, to post billboards on their houses, to open their stores on Sunday mornings, or to obtain insurance only on one side of the Mississippi River or in states that vote for Democrats. Each of these examples, and many others, would violate (or raise serious questions under) the First, Fifth, or Fourteenth Amendment. These are just some among the many constitutional norms that continue to fence arbitrary or abusive federal power, even if purchase mandates are permitted.

### AT: DA turns the case

#### Transportation federalism fails – hurts investment and undermines stability.

Yonah Freemark, independent researcher working on comparative urban development as part of a Gordon Grand Fellowship from Yale University, 2/16/2012, “Clearing it Up on Federal Transportation Expenditures,” The Transport Politic, http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/02/16/clearing-it-up-on-federal-transportation-expenditures/

For one, as I have noted above, states and municipalities have no clear record of choosing to invest in better projects when they are fully in charge of collecting the revenues to do so. States have too often proven a complete disregard for public transportation investments when they’re left fully in charge — see state infrastructure banks as evidence for that fact. While federal investments in transportation have been far from perfect, they have nonetheless provided for the significant expansion in transit offerings we’re now seeing. From the 1980s on, the Congress has maintained a steady stream of funding for transit from the fuel tax revenues it collects. How many states, which collect a huge amount of fuel tax revenues themselves, can say the same? But the most important role of the federal government in transportation financing is to ensure that funding is maintained during economic downturns. The Obama Administration actually increased spending on roads and transit projects following the 2008 recession, despite a decline in federal fuel tax revenues, because it was able to use its power of deficit spending (an authority state and local governments do not have\*\*) to maintain investments when the country needed them. Devolution is overrated.

#### Federal role doesn’t trade off with state funding.

Yonah Freemark, independent researcher working on comparative urban development as part of a Gordon Grand Fellowship from Yale University, 2/16/2012, “Clearing it Up on Federal Transportation Expenditures,” The Transport Politic, http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/02/16/clearing-it-up-on-federal-transportation-expenditures/

What about those profligate transit agencies that are egged on by the federal government’s wasteful spending? Their operations spending comes from local, state, and fare revenues — not Washington. And expansion projects — especially the big ones — are mostly financed by local revenues, like dedicated sales taxes that voters across the country have approved repeatedly over the past twenty years. The six largest transit expansion projects currently receiving or proposed to receive funding from the Obama Administration this year each rely on the federal government to contribute less than 43% of total costs. Perhaps Detroit would have paid for the People Mover even if it had had to use its own revenues to do so.

#### Federalist model doesn’t improve transportation investments.

Yonah Freemark, independent researcher working on comparative urban development as part of a Gordon Grand Fellowship from Yale University, 2/16/2012, “Clearing it Up on Federal Transportation Expenditures,” The Transport Politic, http://www.thetransportpolitic.com/2012/02/16/clearing-it-up-on-federal-transportation-expenditures/

I can think of plenty of expensive and arguably inappropriate transit projects paid for by local governments that would not meet the guidelines to be funded by the federal government under its competitive programs. Should we hail Mr. Katz’s “laboratories of democracy” that produced these? Would Mr. Glaeser have these federal grant programs dismantled so states or localities could fund underperforming transit?

### AT: Federalism Solves War

#### Federalism doesn’t prevent civil and secessionist wars.

Pietro Nivola, Senior Fellow in Governance Studies at the Brookings Institution, October 2005, “Why Federalism Matters,” Brookings Policy Brief #146, http://www.brookings.edu/papers/2005/10governance\_nivola.aspx

Where truly profound regional linguistic, religious, or cultural differences persist, however, federating is by no means a guarantee of national harmony. Canada, Spain, and the former Yugoslavia are wellknown cases of federations that either periodically faced secessionist movements (Quebec), or have had to struggle with them continually (the Basques), or collapsed in barbarous civil wars (the Balkans). Iraq seems headed for the same fate. The Sunni minority there is resisting a draft constitution that would grant regional autonomy not only to the Kurds in the north but to Shiite sectarians in the oil-rich south. So far, proposed federalism for Iraq is proving to be a recipe for disaccord, not accommodation.

#### Federalism doesn’t prevent secessionism and conflict – examples prove.

Michael Kelly, Director of Legal Research, Writing & Advocacy at Michigan State University's Detroit College of Law, 1999, “Political downsizing: The re-emergence of self-determination, and the movement toward smaller, ethnically homogenous states,” Drake Law Review, p.242.

Just as devolution has been seized upon by nation-states, federal or otherwise, as a way to address the self-deterministic aspirations of communities within their borders, so too has federalism been attempted by non-federal nation-states as a self- preservationist move toward the middle ground between separatists and advocates of stronger centralized government. The examples, however, of Mali, Uganda, Ethiopia, Zaire (now Congo), Nigeria, Kenya, and the Cameroons bear out the conclusion that these efforts, at least in post-colonial Africa, have generally failed, except for the notable recent example of South Africa under its new constitution. Consequently, while federated systems of government can work in multi-ethnic states, with the appropriate degree of top-down devolution of administration and self-government, it seems that they cannot be universally extrapolated to work in every instance.

#### Decentralization doesn’t prevent secession – can’t satiate the demands of minorities.

Daniel Treisman, Professor of Political Science at the University of California, Los Angeles, 2007, The Architecture of Government: Rethinking Political Decentralization, p.240.

A third problem with the argument that decentralization can satisfy limited demands for autonomy is that the demands of ethnic minorities may not be limited. The group may be secretly committed to secession. In this case, decentralization will strengthen it in its efforts to secede. Introducing local elections can give local separatist leaders the legitimacy of a popular mandate and the administrative resources of local government office. If tax revenues are decentralized, local officials may use such funds to fight the center. If law enforcement responsibilities are devolved, local separatist leaders can set up secessionist militias. As Roeder (1999, p.870) puts it: “Every power assigned to an ethnic group is also a potential weapon to be used against another ethnic group and the state at the bargaining table of ethnoconstitutional politics.”

### Turn – Afghani federalism bad

#### Afghani federalism causes foreign intervention and disintegration.

G. Rauf Roashan, Director of the Institute for Afghan Studies, December 6, 2002, “Pros and Cons of Federalism in Afghanistan,” http://www.institute-for-afghan-studies.org/AFGHAN%20CONFLICT/Analysis/Pros%20and%20Cons%20of%20Federalism%20in%20Afghanistan.pdf

A federal system for Afghanistan would make it closer to becoming a Yugoslavia. Although the religious divide in Afghanistan is not between faiths but within the one faith of Islam, ethnic groupings are diverse. However, throughout Afghan history, the ethnic make up of the society has led the Afghans to cherish their status as Afghans rather than members of the ethnic groupings. The name Afghan has become synonymous with a freedom loving nation that has never accepted foreign rule and would never do so. Today in Afghanistan there are more Pashtuns than in Pakistan, more Tajiks than in Tajikistan. This situation has given rise to a political fear in Afghanistan's neighbors. On the other hand, the mostly Shiite Iran eyes a strong influence over the minority Shiites of Afghanistan. Furthermore, the Baloochis live in the three neighboring countries of Pakistan, Iran and Afghanistan in harsh climatic conditions in relative poverty. A federal system in Afghanistan may make it easier for Afghanistan's neighbors to further intervene in the affairs of the country in favor of the ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities that they support and want to befriend. That in itself would create the danger of disintegration of the country. A centralized strong but just system of government would guarantee unity of the nation and maintenance of its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

#### Federalism causes warlordism and Afghani conflict.

Omar Zakhilwal, Professor of Economics at Carleton University, October 2001, Federations, http://www.institute-for-afghan-studies.org/AFGHAN%20CONFLICT/Federalism/Federations%20Magazine%2010-26-01.pdf

If one looks at the history of the unitary system in Afghanistan, one will find that it was compelled by the very things that a federation would lead to in a country like Afghanistan. Federalism is an advanced system of a democratic government that allows citizens to be part of the democratic process and decision-making in all levels of government. However, in a country like Afghanistan, where illiteracy is abundant, the economy is in shambles and land and other natural resources are not evenly distributed across the country, federalism would lead to warlordism, personal fiefdoms, no respect for the central government and a continuation of internal war— this time over who gets what. It might also further the chances of neighbouring countries interfering in the affairs of Afghanistan more effectively and may eventually prove to be a recipe for a permanent division of Afghanistan along ethnic and linguistic lines.

#### Afghani leaders oppose federalism – fear disintegration and foreign intervention.

Daily Outlook Afghanistan, 1/11/2012, “Federalism Called A Recipe for Afghanistan’s Breakup,” http://outlookafghanistan.net/news?post\_id=3077

Amid reports about efforts at introducing a federal system in Afghanistan, Kabul-based political analysts warned on Tuesday such a regime could lead to the disintegration of the war-ravaged country. Media reports say former vice president, Ahmad Zia Masoud, Junbish-i-Millie party chief Abdul Rashid Dostum and the Hezb-i-Wahdat leader Mohammad Mohaqiq were invited to Berlin, Germany, by a US congressman to convince them into initiating efforts for a federal system in Afghanistan. In a joint statement, the leaders said they had a meeting with a number of US congressmen who believed the presidential form of government had resulted in numerous problems. They were urged to launch efforts for a decentralized and pluralistic form of government. The politicians insisted provincial governors should be given more powers. To discuss the Berlin meeting, political analysts held a gathering at the Afghanistan Regional Studies Centre in Kabul. The center's chief, Abdul Ghafoor Lewal, claimed Monday's meeting in Berlin was not a political gathering, but a plot to divide Afghanistan. He said a federal system under the current circumstances meant poisoning the countrymen. The idea could lead to disintegration of the country, he feared. Lewal said the federal system, which could not work for the betterment of Afghans, would further fuel ethnic, linguistic and tribal differences in the country. Such a scheme would pave the way for more foreign interference, he believed.

### Turn – Iraqi Federalism Bad 1/2

#### Federalism causes Iraqi and regional ethnic conflict.

Imad Salamey and Frederic Pearson, Assistant Professor at the American University of Technology and Professor of Political Science at Wayne State University, May 2005, International Studies Perspectives, pp.198-199.

Federalism in Iraq would crucially impact the bordering states as well. Kanan Makiya, a leading Iraqi dissident intellectual and author of the Democratic Principles Working Group report for the State Department's Future of Iraq Project, concluded that the ethnic-based federalization of Iraq would lead only to the country's distress. He maintained that such a plan not only would establish economic and social barriers between the federated states but also would further invite regional meddling in Iraq's internal affairs. It would boost ethnic and religious identities and intensify separatist drives among the Kurds in the North and the Shi'a in the South, who would discover new power and self-government they never attained before. This would alarm every state bordering Iraq that maintains a substantial Kurdish or Shi'a minority, or even other ethnic mixes. As a direct result Turkey, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Bahrain, and Iran might be "forced" to take an active involvement in Iraq so as to curb (or encourage) either Kurdish or Shi'a aspirations and to use this leverage against the Iraqi state. Depending upon how it is administered, therefore, Iraqi federalism could prove to be an active ingredient in regional instability and ethno-religious fragmentation. Ethnic and sectarian groups in the Middle East might be encouraged by the Iraqi example to seek the intervention of outside powers in demanding autonomous regions of their own. For a multi-ethnic multi-sectarian Middle East, this would imply a widespread geopolitical upheaval leading toward greater fragmentation and instability and potentially toward more governmental repression and police states. As yet none of the federalist advocates have provided satisfactory answers and implemental plans. As Kanan Makiya observed, "neither the Kurdish parliament nor the INC [Iraqi National Congress] have specified what they mean by 'federalism,' nor have they worked out its practical implications, especially with regard to the mechanics of power sharing and resource distribution."

#### Iraqi federalism causes resource conflicts.

Imad Salamey and Frederic Pearson, Assistant Professor at the American University of Technology and Professor of Political Science at Wayne State University, May 2005, International Studies Perspectives, p.197.

The major initial danger of such an envisioned federation plan would be the emergence of a struggle over resources between as well as within the provinces. Antagonism between oil- and water-rich provinces versus poor regions could be established. Areas south of the Tigris and Euphrates would continue to demand greater flow of water from the Northern provinces. Regions with water outlets to the Arabian–Persian Gulf would presumably have greater leverage on the process of oil export delivered via the sea or future pipelines from the inland provinces. Historic and territorial claims would only fuel tensions. For example, the city of Kirkuk could represent a disputed area between the Kurds and the Arabs. Territorial demarcations would therefore potentially represent sources of conflict and reasons for ongoing power struggle between the provinces. All of this would require intricate bargaining and brokering among the contending forces, a phenomenon not unknown in Iraqi history, but one seldom undertaken before in a Western democratic context.

### Turn – Iraqi Federalism Bad 2/2

#### Their evidence is all theoretical – actual implementation of Iraqi federalism causes fragmentation and conflict.

Hayder al-Khoei, researcher at the Centre for Academic Shi'a Studies, 12/27/2011, “Iraq is not ready for division,” The Guardian, http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2011/dec/27/iraq-federalism-division

This is the worst possible solution for Iraq now. To implement federalism in this highly charged atmosphere sends the wrong message to the people of Iraq and to the world. Federalism as a solution misdiagnoses the crisis. The real problem is not centralised government but politicians who have failed the people. Iraq must wait until a rational debate on federalism can focus on good governance as opposed to defending sectarian identities. Otherwise, if calls for partition drown out those calling for calm and patience, there will be another bloodbath reminiscent of the civil war in 2006-08. It would be impossible to implement widescale federalism now without engaging in violent conflict. Theory is one thing, but the reality on the ground tells a different story. Iraq has never in its history been neatly geographically divided along ethno-sectarian lines. If the wheels of division were to come into motion, Sunni, Shia and Kurdish forces would scramble to seize control of mixed and disputed territories.

### Turn – Libyan federalism bad

#### Libyan federalism causes civil war and foreign intervention.

Hussain Kreiba, Staff Member at the University of Al-Mergib, College of Education in Zliten, 3/22/2012, “The Issue of Federalism,” The Tripoli Post, http://www.tripolipost.com/articledetail.asp?c=5&i=8060

In Libya, federalism seems to be a sensitive issue as in case, the federal way of governing is adopted, that may open the door for different regions to establish federal states first and then they may seek independence from the central government. Federalism may be difficult to apply to some developing countries. In Sudan, the federal system led to the division of the country into two states with some other regions seeking independence from the central government. Moreover, the division of Sudan into two independent countries was followed by conflicts over the oil-rich regions in the country. Another reason why federalism is not favoured in Libya is that Libya has a small number of population, and practically a federal system may not be conducive to establishing a powerful country if Libya is divided into two or more federal regions. That may make many foreign countries interfere in the Libyan affairs for the sake of their material interests and at the expense of our national interests.

#### Libyan federalism causes resource conflict.

Jason Pack, PhD student of Libyan history at Cambridge University andpresident of Libya-Analysis.com , 4/20/2012, “Federalism in Libya: Tried and failed,” Al Jazeera, http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2012/04/201241871355584880.html

Today's Libya requires the rapid creation of nation-wide institutions and human capital that Libyan history shows is incompatible with federalism. Yet, the proponents of federalism wish to decide taxes and budgets at the provincial level - a sure recipe for gridlock. Furthermore, one of the few positive legacies of Gaddafi's rule is his construction of extensive water and oil pipelines that link the provinces together. For example, much of Libya's oil is extracted in Cyrenaica and brought via pipelines to the Sirte Basin, while the majority of Libya's groundwater comes from aquifers in southern Cyrenaica but is consumed in the populous areas of Western Tripolitania. A return to a "federal" governmental model would inevitably endanger these gains unleashing a competition over strategic resources - especially those in the Sirte Basin where Cyrenaica and Tripolitania meet.

#### Federalism historically fails in Libya.

Jason Pack, PhD student of Libyan history at Cambridge University andpresident of Libya-Analysis.com , 4/20/2012, “Federalism in Libya: Tried and failed,” Al Jazeera, http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2012/04/201241871355584880.html

Amid the ongoing tumult, over-eager commentators warn that Libya is poised to fracture along regional, tribal, and provincial lines. Ambassador Akbar Ahmed, Chair of Islamic Studies at American University in Washington, has written in an Al Jazeera English Opinion piece that federalism is the only solution which would be in fitting with Libyan history. The reverse is true. Federalism was tried in the Kingdom of Libya between 1951 and 1963. It facilitated dysfunctional governance, widespread corruption, and redundant government offices at the national and provincial levels simultaneously enacting conflicting policies. Provincial legislators and bureaucrats were local notables protecting their fiefdoms - similar to the militias and regional strongmen of today. Taxation policy was subject to a provincial veto rendering wide-scale planning unwieldy.

## Private CP Answers

### Aff – Solvency

#### Privatization destroys transportation infrastructure – benefits are myth

Lisa Schweitzer, Associate professor in the School of Policy, Planning and Development at USC, 7/13/2011, “For sale: U.S. infrastructure?” LA Times,

http://articles.latimes.com/2011/jul/13/opinion/la-oe-schweitzer-infrastructure-20110713

Maybe Mica is right. But rushing to privatize state-owned assets can lead to terrible infrastructure deals that let private companies walk away with prime assets and leave taxpayers with no guarantee of better services or lower fees.

#### Privatization fails – wont attract investment

Lisa Schweitzer, Associate professor in the School of Policy, Planning and Development at USC, 7/13/2011, “For sale: U.S. infrastructure?” LA Times,

http://articles.latimes.com/2011/jul/13/opinion/la-oe-schweitzer-infrastructure-20110713

So far, privately run transportation projects show mixed outcomes. For every successful privatization story of service improvement and mounting profits — Britain's airport privatization, say — there's a disaster story of poor service and taxpayers left holding the bailout bag: think the Chunnel or Chicago's privatized parking woes. Privatized transportation projects carry risks for both sides. So long as Americans refuse to even index gas taxes to inflation, let alone raise the tax outright, we won't be spending enough to maintain our transportation infrastructure, which means that its value will continue to fall. That will make it difficult to attract private investment or get a fair price for state-owned assets if the government opts to privatize its transportation assets. Too many more years of disinvestment and we will have to make gun-to-the-head decisions like Greece's, shock ourselves with big tax increases later, or both.

#### Europe proves privatization failure

Lisa Schweitzer, Associate professor in the School of Policy, Planning and Development at USC, 7/13/2011, “For sale: U.S. infrastructure?” LA Times,

http://articles.latimes.com/2011/jul/13/opinion/la-oe-schweitzer-infrastructure-20110713

Many European countries and cities have privatized infrastructure and city services. You want to use the highway — you pay. You want to stroll through a "public" garden — you pay. You can avoid higher taxes, but if you want the services, you pay the private company that holds the franchise. It is a system that works fine for those with cash to spend. Scaling down public ownership of transportation networks also means carefully selecting which parts of the system to sell or lease out. Private companies usually desire assets associated with the most demand for services, such as the Northeast Corridor. But if we sell off or lease these assets to get private companies to build a high-speed rail system there, we may also be giving up the only part of a high-speed rail network likely to generate enough cash in the long term to keep a national system running without taxpayer help.

### Aff – Links to Politics

#### Transportation privatization is a political firestorm – the recession undermined trust in markets

Clifford Winston, Senior fellow in Economic Studies at the Brookings Institution, 9/14/2010, “Last Exit: Privatization and Deregulation of the U.S. Transportation System,”

http://www.brookings.edu/research/books/2010/lastexit

The deep recession that began in late 2007 has significantly reduced the public’s and policymakers’ confidence in markets and undoubtedly made it more difficult politically to privatize and deregulate the transportation system. Of course, the U.S. economy will eventually grow again for a sustained period, and memories of the recession’s effects will start to fade. In addition several factors suggest it is important to look beyond the current political climate. First, as noted, the problems associated with the transportation sys- tem are primarily attributable to government failure, not market failure, and the public has become frustrated with the government’s inability to improve the system. Second, the nation has been searching for the optimal mix of public and private participation in transportation for three centuries, and it is not going to accept the status quo as a long-run equilibrium. Third, politi- cal winds shift very quickly, as indicated by the public’s growing concern that the Obama administration’s intervention in the economy may be exces- sive. Fourth, budgetary pressures have made public officials more receptive to private sector participation in transportation, while the long-term effects of the recession have intensified officials’ interest in private sector innovations in transportation and other areas of the economy that could spur the nation’s growth.

#### Powerful interest groups oppose transportation privatization

Clifford Winston, Senior fellow in Economic Studies at the Brookings Institution, 9/14/2010, “Last Exit: Privatization and Deregulation of the U.S. Transportation System,”

http://www.brookings.edu/research/books/2010/lastexit

To be sure, overcoming the status quo will be difficult when the costs of change are concentrated among powerful interest groups and the benefits are likely to be broadly dispersed. The experiments that I am advocating are intended to build political support carefully by convincing transportation users, a critical interest group that is likely to be skeptical about privatization and deregulation, that they will be better off. For example, Schaller (2010) argues that a key lesson from New York City’s failed effort to implement Mayor Michael Bloomberg’s congestion pricing plan is that drivers must be convinced that highway tolls would make them better off. Policymakers could then overcome remaining interests, especially labor, by arguing that the status quo is not a viable option because the transportation system will only continue to get worse given the enormous fiscal deficits and that privatization and deregulation could relieve budgetary pressures and spur innovation and economic growth.

#### The counterplan will be controversial – looks too extreme

Clifford Winston, Senior fellow in Economic Studies at the Brookings Institution, 9/14/2010, “Last Exit: Privatization and Deregulation of the U.S. Transportation System,”

http://www.brookings.edu/research/books/2010/lastexit

Privatization and deregulation may appear to be an extreme approach, especially given past problems with private provision of certain transportation services and infrastructure and current doubts about whether markets can be trusted to deliver essential services. At the same time, govern- ment failure in transportation has solidified inefficient practices that must be purged and has slowed technological advance that must be accelerated. Private firms may accomplish those goals if they are not constrained by the kinds of regulatory int

### Aff – Highways

#### Privatization logic doesn’t apply to highways – competition not feasible

Chad Shirley, Deputy Assistant Director at Congressional Budget Office, January 2011, “Spending and Funding for Highways,” pg. 1

The public sector provides most highway infrastructure for several reasons that tend to limit the role of the private sector. First, such infrastructure displays, at least to some degree, important characteristics of “public goods.” Such goods are usually not profitable for the private sector to produce, because once they have been produced, they are available to anyone who wants to use them; as a result, they are often provided by the public sector. Second, because such infrastructure is costly to build, though less expensive to operate and maintain, having competing highway networks is not practical. As a result, such “natural monopolies” are often either provided directly by the government or regulated by it.

#### Interstate commerce concerns prevent privatization solvency

Chad Shirley, Deputy Assistant Director at Congressional Budget Office, January 2011, “Spending and Funding for Highways,” pg. 1

Third, the benefits of highways—promoting commerce, for instance—may extend beyond the places where they are built and beyond the people who use them directly. All three of those characteristics of highway infrastructure tend to limit the incentives for the private sector to provide it. The private sector, on its own, would provide less of that type of infrastructure than is socially beneficial.

#### Federal action key to solve the Interstate Highway system – dispute mediation

Robert Poole, President of the Reason Foundation, June 2000, “Another Reason for Airport Privatization,” http://www.thefreemanonline.org/features/another-reason-for-airport-privatization/

If we could start with a clean sheet of paper in the highway sector, it would seem obvious that federal transportation dollars should be narrowly focused on transportation projects that are clearly national in scope or impact. Instead of focusing on funding state programs through a highly politicized process plagued by redistribution, pork barrel spending and projects that would never pass a benefit/cost analysis, federal transportation policy should focus on key areas of national interest: Maintaining the Interstate system—The federal government should work with states to maintain the core national mobility and goods movement network. Interstate highway upgrades—When state highways link up regionally in fast-growing corridors, sometimes an upgrade to an Interstate will make sense, and the federal government should partner with states to accomplish that. Multi-state coordination—Some transportation problems, particularly in expanding urban areas, have taken on multi-state dimensions. The federal government can serve a useful role in mediating and even coordinating transportation decisions, infrastructure and funding, given its constitutional role in facilitating interstate commerce.

### Aff – Highways

#### Only the federal government can solve – research leadership

Robert Poole, President of the Reason Foundation, June 2000, “Another Reason for Airport Privatization,” http://www.thefreemanonline.org/features/another-reason-for-airport-privatization/

Freight corridors—Producers need the roads to get materials in and products out; services need roads to interact with customers, and consumers need roads to connect with goods and services. Protecting interstate commerce is a national issue and federal transportation policy should ensure that major interstate goods movement corridors and bottlenecks receive adequate capacity and maintenance. Transportation research, safety and related issues—The federal government has been the lead driver on a lot of research into new technologies and methods of managing transportation systems, coordinating common standards, incentivizing experimentation and innovation. Highway safety regulation, in a major nation involved in the global economy, needs to be uniform and national in scope, so it is appropriate that the National Highway & Traffic Safety Administration (NHTSA) and the National Motor Carrier Safety Administration (NMCSA) be part of the U.S. Department of Transportation and federally funded.

#### Historical evidence proves highway privatization failure

John Williamson, Information Research Specialist at the Congressional Research Service, 1/6/2012, “Federal Aid to Roads and Highways Since the 18th Century: A Legislative History,” www.fas.org/sgp/crs/misc/R42140.pdf

In the absence of significant federal support for highways in the late 18th and early 19th centuries, and with state encouragement and, often, investment, private companies built toll roads in many states. The roads were often financially unsuccessful unless they connected city pairs or provided a farm-or-factory-to-market route with sufficient traffic to cover costs. In discussing the failures of these roads, Secretary Albert Gallatin wrote, It is sufficiently evident that, whenever the annual expense of transportation on a certain route, in its natural state, exceeds the interest on the capital employed in improving the communication, and the annual expense of transportation (exclusively of the tolls) by the improved route, the difference is an annual additional income to the nation. Nor does in that case the general result vary, although the tolls may not have been fixed at a rate sufficient to pay to the undertakers the interest on the capital laid out. They, indeed, when that happens, lose; but the community is nevertheless benefited by the undertaking.8 The boom in turnpike construction began in the late 1790s and lasted, with a roughly 10-year interruption in the 1830s, until the mid-19th century.9 By 1830, more than 8,000 miles of roads had been built or converted to turnpikes under state charters of incorporation. Very few toll roads made consistent profits for their investors and the failure rate appears to have been high even in the early years predating rail and canal competition. Despite these financial difficulties, the toll roads were, without a doubt, the best roads in the country, and had a significant role in short- and medium-distance freight and passenger movement between the cities and larger towns. With the spread of the railway networks, however, the toll roads lost nearly all their passenger and most of their freight business to rail competition. As the longer turnpikes failed, shorter toll roads were chartered as feeder lines to rail service.

#### Toll inflation undermines counterplan solvency

JayEtta Z. Hecker, Director of Physical Infrastructure Issues at the GAO, 7/24/, 2008, “HIGHWAY PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS. More Rigorous Up-front Analysis Could Better Secure Potential Benefits and Protect the Public Interest,” www.gao.gov/new.items/d081052t.pdf

Highway public-private partnerships have resulted in advantages for state and local governments, such as obtaining new facilities and value from existing facilities without using public funding. The public can potentially obtain other benefits, such as sharing risks with the private sector, more efficient operations and management of facilities, and, through the use of tolling, increased mobility and more cost effective investment decisions. There are also potential costs and trade-offs—there is no “free” money in public-private partnerships and it is likely that tolls on a privately operated highway will increase to a greater extent than they would on a publicly operated toll road. There is also the risk of tolls being set that exceed the costs of the facility, including a reasonable rate of return, should a private concessionaire gain market power because of the lack of viable travel alternatives. Highway public-private partnerships are also potentially more costly to the public than traditional procurement methods and the public sector gives up a measure of control, such as the ability to influence toll rates. Finally, as with any highway project, there are multiple stakeholders and trade-offs in protecting the public interest.

### Aff – Highways – Links to Politics

#### The counterplan will be massively unpopular – politicians will want to distance themselves from perceived craziness

Walter Block, Professor Economics at Loyola University New Orleans, 2009, “The Privatization of Roads and Highways,” pg. xv

Most people who read this book will dismiss it as the ravings of a lunatic. For I advocate the complete, total and full privatization of all roads, streets, highways, byways, avenues and other vehicular thoroughfares. And I am serious about this, deadly serious. This is so far off the radar of public policy analysis and apart from the concerns of politicians, pundits, and commentators, that few people will take it seriously. Do not be one of them. Your very life may be at stake. For over 40,000 people die on the nation’s roadways every year (see appendix), and you or a loved one might one day join this horrid list.

#### Congress won’t take privatization proposals seriously

Walter Block, Professor Economics at Loyola University New Orleans, 2009, “The Privatization of Roads and Highways,” pg. 6

The explanation of apathy toward highway mismanagement that seems most reasonable is that people simply do not see any alternative to government ownership. Just as no one “opposes” or “protests” a volcano, which is believed to be beyond the control of man, there are very few who oppose governmental road-way control. Along with death and taxes, state highway management seems to have become an immutable, if unstated, fact. The institution of government has planned, built, managed and maintained our highway network for so long that few people can imagine any other workable possibility. While Peltzman puts his finger on the proximate causes of highway accidents, such as excessive speed and alcohol, he has ignored the agency, government, which has set itself up as the manager of the roadway apparatus. This is akin to blaming a snafu in a restaurant on the fact that the oven went out, or that the waiter fell on a slippery floor with a loaded tray. Of course the proximate causes of cus- tomer dissatisfaction are uncooked meat or food in their laps. Yet how can these factors be blamed, while the part of restaurant management is ignored? It is the restaurant manager’s job to insure that the ovens are performing satisfactorily, and that the floors are properly maintained. If he fails, the blame rests on his shoulders, not on the ovens or floors. We hold the trigger man responsible for murder, not the bullet.

#### Psychological conditioning will fuel rejection of the counterplan

Walter Block, Professor Economics at Loyola University New Orleans, 2009, “The Privatization of Roads and Highways,” pg.8

A fully private market in roads, streets, and highways is likely to be rejected out of hand, first because of psychological reasons. The initial response of most people goes something as follows: Why, that’s impossible. You just can’t do it. There would be millions of people killed in traffic accidents; traffic jams the likes of which have never been seen would be an everyday occurrence; If we were to divide such a statement into its cognitive and psychological (or emotive) elements, it must be stated right at the outset that there is nothing at all reprehensible about the intellectual challenge. Far from it. Indeed, if these charges cannot be satisfactorily answered, the whole idea of private roads shall have to be considered a failure. There is also an emotive element which is responsible, perhaps, not for the content of the objection, but for the hysterical manner in which it is usually couched and the unwillingness, even, to consider the case. The psychological component stems from a feeling that government road management is inevitable and that any other alternative is therefore unthinkable. It is this emotional factor that must be flatly rejected.

### Aff – Ports

#### Privatized ports fail – short sighted profit seeking will outweigh effectiveness

Christopher Clott, Associate Professor of Maritime Policy and Management at CSU – Vallejo, 2009, “The Shape of Things to Come: Private Investment in Maritime Port Infrastructure,” www.metrans.org/nuf/2009/documents/Clott.pdf

Maritime port privatization in some circumstances can stimulate and revitalize port infrastructure development for competitive advantage. This can enable both the port operation and private investors to benefit over many years. The risk to privatization however is that public assets are undervalued, underinvested, or in some way misutilized through poorly structured contractual agreements. Short-sighted, profit motivated fiscal goals of port authorities and localities may get in the way of truly grasping how the private interests will maintain public infrastructures for the common good of the state or locality. Private investors who are far removed from the port properties they own or manage may not treat the “public trust” in the same way that port authorities answerable to voters and local or state governments are required to do. Global private equity firms must meet expectations of adequate return on investment to attract investors. Maritime ports operating in an intensely competitive environment may not be able to guarantee the steady rates on return demanded.

#### Privatization undermines long term growth and development of ports

Christopher Clott, Associate Professor of Maritime Policy and Management at CSU – Vallejo, 2009, “The Shape of Things to Come: Private Investment in Maritime Port Infrastructure,” www.metrans.org/nuf/2009/documents/Clott.pdf

Opponents of privatization have argued that the sheer scale of maritime infrastructure projects involving major public works and benefits would take significant economic functions outside of governmental oversight. Long term decisions on growth and development of ports would be made by private organizations and individuals that may not be in the best interests of the citizens of the state or locality. Companies with port and terminal interests in other ports may make decisions to send ships to other ports or de-emphasize a particular venue for business reasons.

#### Privatized ports fail – no long term perspective or expertise

Christopher Clott, Associate Professor of Maritime Policy and Management at CSU – Vallejo, 2009, “The Shape of Things to Come: Private Investment in Maritime Port Infrastructure,” www.metrans.org/nuf/2009/documents/Clott.pdf

Greater private sector involvement in the container port sector does not irrevocably lead to improved efficiency (Cullinane, Ji & Wang, 2005). Private equity firms over the last two decades profited from business models designed around buying companies through highly leveraged borrowed money, stripping them of assets and then selling pieces of the firm at a profit to the market. Can private equity firms invest in infrastructure with a long term perspective, how long will they stay, and what expertise do they bring to the industry (Knight, 2006)? For example, the Macquarie Infrastructure Group is seeking to sell its interest in the Chicago Skyway which it purchased with Cintra in 2005 to reduce its debt load. The sale of the 99 year lease would pose a challenge for the firm and the city in the current economic environment (Bloomberg, 2009).

### Aff – Railroads

#### Government investment key to high speed rail – private sector commitment will be insufficient

The Economist, 1/26/2011, "A modest proposal," www.economist.com/blogs/gulliver/2011/06/privatising-amtrak

That said, Mr Mica's logic has some serious flaws of its own. He argues that privatising the north-east corridor will be a faster path to high-speed rail than leaving the transition in the hands of a government bureaucracy that has repeatedly failed to deliver on its promises. But surely the congressman is aware that most high-speed systems elsewhere in the first world were built with enormous investments of government money (not to mention exercises of government power, including eminent domain seizures to find land for new routes). Major infrastructure projects, be they airports, highways, or railroads, are more often than not undertaken with significant government support. Privatisation of established rail lines has been successful before and can be again. But Americans shouldn't trick themselves into thinking that private investors will willingly foot the bill for massively upgrading the nation's high-speed rail infrastructure. There's plenty of room for creative public-private partnerships. But if Americans decide they want true high-speed rail, the bulk of the risk—and the initial costs—will almost certainly have to be borne by the taxpayers.

#### Privatization fails and links to politics

The Economist, 1/26/2011, "A modest proposal," www.economist.com/blogs/gulliver/2011/06/privatising-amtrak

SHOULD parts of Amtrak, America's sclerotic government-owned passenger rail service, be privatised? On Wednesday, the Republican-led House of Representatives held a hearing to discuss a privatisation plan backed by Rep. John Mica (R-Fla.). Mr Mica's plan would spin off Amtrak's most valuable assets—its infrastructure and service along America's crowded north-east corridor, which stretches from Boston to Washington, DC. The plan isn't going anywhere: it's very likely to be dead-on-arrival in the Senate, and would almost certainly be vetoed by President Barack Obama. But Amtrak apparently felt vulnerable: it sent a letter to Mr Mica, who chairs the House Transportation and Infrastructure committee, warning that his plan "would likely mean the end of Amtrak and the national passenger rail system that Congress authorized nearly 40 years ago."

#### Amtrak solves rail modernization best

The Hill, 6/15/2011, "Privatization proposal 'takes Amtrak apart'," thehill.com/blogs/transportation-report/railroads/166657-ceo-privatization-proposal-takes-amtrak-apart

"Chairman Mica and I share a strong interest in high speed rail, particularly in the Northeast Corridor," LaHood said in a written statement. "He should be commended for giving this topic the attention it deserves. However, based upon our preliminary review, we have many questions about the Mica proposal's feasibility. At present, we believe Amtrak is the entity most capable of taking the next steps to modernize rail service in the Northeast Corridor, which is why the administration has serious concerns about any proposal to privatize Amtrak's Northeast Corridor.

### Aff – Space

#### NASA leadership crucial to investment and technology – key to solve Mars mission.

David M. Livingston, business consultant, financial advisor, and strategic planner, 8/10/2000, “From Earth to Mars: A Cooperative Plan,” http://www.spacefuture.com/archive/from\_earth\_to\_mars\_a\_cooperative\_plan.shtml

When the private sector does participate in a manned mission to Mars, the investment should be based on standards that are used for a terrestrial investment of similar risk and character. There will be stringent requirements for any company to earn an acceptable return on investment, net present value, internal rate of return, and a payback on the investment. The existence of a suitable exit strategy is also important. Delay factors will also need to be included in the financial analysis. Furthermore, without NASA leadership or policy advocating a manned mission to Mars, companies will have difficulty raising capital for the project. Still another financial barrier for the private sector is the fact that there is no clear profit potential for a Mars mission. There is entertainment, media, sponsorship, and advertising potential for the trip to and from Mars as well as for the stay on Mars; however, the market and expected revenues from these activities is largely uncertain. The absence of a more certain profit potential adds to the difficulty in raising investment capital for such a mission, but on a more basic level it simply thwarts most private-sector interest in the mission as businesses focus their attention on more realistic and potentially profitable ventures. Investment capital appears to be plentiful at the beginning of the twenty-first century, but it is still a finite resource. Unless a company or individual decides to invest in the Mars mission regardless of all other factors, investment capital will most likely go to the venture with the most profit potential for the least amount of risk. Terrestrial investments will almost always have the advantage in attracting investment capital. In addition, terrestrial investments have the least amount of risk since the infrastructure already exists on Earth for business ventures and transportation, the political risks are usually known, the legal environment is more certain, and, in most cases, new technology and engineering requirements are unnecessary.

#### Private sector can’t fill in fast enough – risks collapse of US space leadership.

David Kushner, award-winning journalist, September 2010, “Launching Into the Era of Private Spaceflight,” Discover, http://discovermagazine.com/2010/sep/18-launching-into-age-of-private-spaceflight/article\_view?b\_start:int=0&-C=

To start flying humans into space, Sierra Nevada (or any other private firm) will have to reach many milestones in development, testing, and financing. Not only do the companies need to pass NASA’s safety standards with unproved spacecraft, but they must train astronauts on the new equipment as well. Even the most optimistic estimates suggest it will be three to five years before a commercial vehicle is ready to reach the International Space Station. In other words, the United States faces the exact same gap in space access that got Sirangelo motivated to begin developing the Dream Chaser five years ago. “The shuttle will stop flying next year, and we’re not going to have a human-rated vehicle to take to station. That problem is our fault,” Olson admits. The problem could get worse. If the commercial companies cannot deliver the vehicles on the anticipated schedule, NASA will have no back-up other than the Soyuz. Even Voss questions the timing of NASA’s sudden conversion to a free-market philosophy. “I think they made a mistake by canceling the Constellation program without having an alternative in place,” he says.

### Aff – Space

#### Shift to the private sector causes imposition of new government regulation – collapses innovation and tech.

Eric R. Sterner, George C. Marshall Institute, April 2010, “Worthy of a Great Nation? NASA’s Change of Strategic Direction,” George C. Marshall Institute Policy Outlook, http://www.marshall.org/pdf/materials/797.pdf

The Obama administration’s approach will undo that balance. While it has retained and expanded COTS, in many ways to its credit, its cancellation of Constellation raises the stakes for COTS and commercial human spaceflight in general. It will no longer be an experiment in promoting innovation with the potential to evolve into something more comprehensive. Instead, it will become the government’s primary means of sending people to space. As such, there will be strong pressure on the government to exercise increased oversight and accountability, undermining, if not eventually eliminating, the very flexibility built into the COTS concept. Indeed, this is already happening. A Congressional hearing revealed an already extant conflict over responsibilities between the Federal Aviation administration, which has legal responsibility for regulating commercial human spaceflight, and NASA, which is responsible for the safety of its astronauts. Given the nature of bureaucratic politics, it is quite likely that both agencies will impose different sets of standards on commercial human spaceflight service providers. Those regulatory burdens may well flow down to suborbital service providers as well, since NASA has raised the possibility of using those service providers to enable government research. A mature industry with a healthy demand for its services may be able to respond to and carry such burdens. The commercial human spaceflight industry, which is still in its infancy, may be stifled by them. Of equal concern, it should be noted that the Congress imposed several non-mission related requirements on Constellation, such as maintaining the workforce and using as much shuttle-heritage hardware as possible. These kinds of requirements do not usually contribute to performance or cost-effectiveness, but serve other legitimate public policy goals. There is some indication that leading members of Congress will seek to impose them on the commercial industry if the industry becomes the primary means of carrying Americans to orbit.

### Aff – Space – Links to Politics

#### CP links to politics – private space action is controversial.

John M. Logsdon, Space Policy Institute, Elliott School of International Affairs, George Washington University, February 2011, “A new US approach to human spaceflight?” Space Policy, p.15

The Obama proposal came under immediate attack from members of Congress whose districts would be affected by the new strategy, firms that were threatened by the cancellation of their Constellation contracts, and spaceflight veterans, including several Apollo astronauts. The criticisms focused on the viability of relying on the private sector for crew transport to the ISS and the lack of specific goals and schedules for deep space exploration missions. Senator Richard Shelby (R-AL) succeeded in getting a provision written into law that prohibited NASA from cancelling any Constellation contracts and from starting the new programs proposed by the president until the Congress completed action on the FY2011 budget proposal and had either approved, rejected or modified the new human spaceflight strategy.

#### Congress opposes private leadership of space

Esther Dyson, chairman of EDventure Holdings and an investor in a variety of start-ups, 2/8/2010, “Prepare for Liftoff,” Foreign Policy, http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/02/08/prepare\_for\_liftoff

However, common sense doesn't always rule in politics. When the Internet opened up to commerce, there were objections from the high priests of the cyberspace, who didn't want anyone to turn their holy calling into a business. In the case of space, there are jobs at stake and, more importantly, politicians' careers at stake. Obama is proposing to cancel some $25 billion in NASA programs -- with most of the cuts affecting jobs in Alabama, Utah, and Texas, whose congressional delegations are now up in arms.

#### CP controversial – powerful politicians oppose moves to privatize space

David Kushner, award-winning journalist, September 2010, “Launching Into the Era of Private Spaceflight,” Discover, http://discovermagazine.com/2010/sep/18-launching-into-age-of-private-spaceflight/article\_view?b\_start:int=0&-C=

But many politicians and pundits do not trust that private companies can get the job done safely and effectively. Their concerns range from the technological challenges to the economics of putting people into space: If NASA downsizes, where will the money come from to finance the development of a whole new industry? And if other customers do not materialize, can NASA alone keep that industry afloat? The attacks have been especially swift and sharp from senators Barbara Mikulski (D-MD) and Richard Shelby (R-AL), who represent states that currently get substantial NASA investment, as well as from former Apollo astronauts Neil Armstrong and Eugene Cernan. Armstrong called the cancellation of Constellation "devastating." More surprising, even major aerospace companies have expressed doubt. John Karas, vice president and general manager of human spaceflight at Lockheed Martin, recently declared, “I don’t think there is a business case for us.”

### Aff - Airports

#### Airport privatization fails – proponents are blinded by ideology

Altaf Rahamatulla, Tax and Budget Policy Specialist at the Progressive States Network, 10/26/2009, "Privatization during an economic downturn: still inefficient and proplematic,” www.progressivestates.org/news/dispatch/privatization-during-economic-downturn-still-inefficient-and-problematic

The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP) estimates that in 2010 and 2011, states will face a combined budget deficit of $350 billion. As states grapple with the recession and search for the best methods to alleviate economic and budgetary pressures, some lawmakers continue to propose privatization as an effective policy. In the past few months, there have been proposals to privatize functions across the board: county zoos, libraries, custodial services, parking enforcement, youth shelters, group homes, ambulance services, airports, and transit networks. Wisconsin, for instance, has increasingly privatized the construction engineering services. Just in the past two years, the state outsourced 125 construction engineering jobs, each of which could have been completed by a state worker at a lower cost. Unfortunately, some officials are embracing this "everything must go" attitude towards public assets and services. The lure is the supposed promise that privatization will deliver a short-term budget fix. Yet many privatization efforts, as this Dispatch will highlight, have cost taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars and botched services for the public. That privatization continues to move forward despite such a poor track record reflects pure ideology that the private market delivers the most efficient outcomes, even without demonstrable results. Some states may also be making the more cynical decision to pursue immediate short-term infusions of capital at the expense of long-term financial cost in pursuit of short-term electoral gains. In any case, privatization comes at the expense of long-term investments in the community, sustainable budget policy and public accountability. This Privatization Update is part of a series; for past analysis, please visit the Reform Government Contracts and Restrict Privatization section of our website and see our March 2009 and November 2008 Stateside Dispatches

#### Midway proves failure of airport privatization

Altaf Rahamatulla, Tax and Budget Policy Specialist at the Progressive States Network, 10/26/2009, "Privatization during an economic downturn: still inefficient and proplematic,” www.progressivestates.org/news/dispatch/privatization-during-economic-downturn-still-inefficient-and-problematic

Even in light of the failure of previous attempts, airport privatization still is being pursued by several cities in an effort to encourage economic recovery and increase city revenues.

Chicago Midway Airport: In October 2008, Chicago approved a $2.5 billion, 99-year lease of Midway Airport to the private corporation Midway Investment and Development Company LLC. The deal would have allowed Midway Investment to collect revenue from parking concessions, landing fees and passenger facility charges, while the city would have continued providing police and fire protection. Chicago would have been the first major city to participate in the FAA's privatization program. However, the deal fell apart earlier this year, as Midway Investment could not front the cost of the lease due to the national financial crisis. Phineas Baxandall, a senior analyst at the United States Public Interest Research Group (US PIRG) believes that circumstances surrounding the Midway Airport are an indication of overall trends. In the National Journal, Baxandall comments that the public is wary of infrastructure privatization deals and the Obama administration is more restrained in its approach to privatization compared to those in past years. He concludes, "[w]hat was different about the Midway deal was that a private entity would manage broader policies and planning with a directer interest in maximizing profits rather than advancing public goals. The public would have relied upon the master contract agreement to keep the private operator in line, much like consumers rely on their contract right with an HMO, but without an exit option for 50 years... the collapse of the Midway deal is part of a larger trend against such deals."

### Aff – Airports

#### Not enough corporate interest to sustain airport privatization

Altaf Rahamatulla, Tax and Budget Policy Specialist at the Progressive States Network, 10/26/2009, "Privatization during an economic downturn: still inefficient and proplematic,” www.progressivestates.org/news/dispatch/privatization-during-economic-downturn-still-inefficient-and-problematic

Over a decade ago, Congress authorized the creation of a pilot airport privatization program. Tucked into the Federal Aviation Reauthorization Act of 1996, Section 149 detailed a program that would allow up to five airports to form long-term leases with private entities "as a means of generating access to various sources of private capital for airport improvement and development." An interested entity would submit an application to the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). To attract private investors, the legislation permitted the US Secretary of Transportation to provide exemptions from federal statutory and regulatory requirements. The exemptions would have to be approved by 65% of the airlines serving the particular airport. That same body is responsible for approving any fare or fee increases above the rate of inflation. The program additionally offers private contractors access to federal grants through the Airport Improvement Program (AIP). Just one airport in the country has made use of the program since its inception. In March 2000, The Port Authority of New York and New Jersey signed a $35 million, 99-year lease with a British company, National Express, to privatize Stewart International Airport in Newburgh, NY. Partly due to tensions with the surrounding community and the state, National Express backed out of the deal and the Port Authority reacquired the airport lease for approximately $73 million in 2007. According to the FAA, though a few airports have expressed interest in privatizing since the passage of the 1996 legislation, there is only one airport currently being considered for the pilot program.

## States CP Answers

### Federal Government Key

#### Federal government action key to infrastructure

American Society of Civil Engineers, 2012, “Solutions,” http://www.infrastructurereportcard.org/solutions.

America's infrastructure needs bold leadership and a compelling national level vision. During the 20th Century, the federal government led the way in building our nation's greatest infrastructure systems from the New Deal programs to the Interstate Highway System and the Clean Water Act. Since that time, federal leadership has decreased, and the condition of the nation's infrastructure suffered. Currently most infrastructure investment decisions are made without the benefit of a national vision. That strong national vision must originate with strong federal leadership and be shared by all levels of government and the private sector Without a strong national vision, infrastructure will continue to deteriorate.

#### Federal action key

Neil H. Buchanan, J.D. Ph. D. (economics), is a Visiting Scholar at Cornell Law School, an Associate Professor at The George Washington University Law School, and a former economics professor, Nov-19-2009, “Why the U.S. Government Must Invest in Infrastructure Now, Or Pay A Steep Cost,” FindLaw, http://writ.news.findlaw.com/buchanan/20091119.html.

My basic contention, however, is a simple one: The federal government is the only entity that has the opportunity to change the foundation on which our future prosperity will be built. If we continue to ignore the pressing needs that only the federal government can fill, then our future will be much poorer and more dangerous. And there is no better time than today to address these needs – for infrastructure improvement will address not only the United States' competitiveness, but also its strikingly high levels of unemployment and underemployment.

#### Federal government key to solve in rural areas

Association for General Contractors of America, May-2011, “The Case for Infrastructure & Reform,” http://www.agc.org/galleries/news/Case-for-Infrastructure-Reform.pdf.

Federal investments in infrastructure also are often the best way to ensure the health, safety and economic vitality of sparsely populated rural communities. Many rural communities, indeed many rural states, lack the resources needed to finance the construction of major infrastructure projects like interstate highways, safe drinking water systems, irrigation facilities or floodwater protection. The federal government is uniquely suited to supporting infrastructure investments in these rural communities, especially when so much of our nation depends on the commercial traffic that travels through them and the agricultural products that come from them.

### States Can’t Solve

#### States can’t solve alone

Janet Kavinoky, Feb-16-2012, “5 Answered Questions about Federal Transportation Infrastructure Investment,” Free Enterprise, <http://www.freeenterprise.com/> infrastructure/5-answered-questions-about-federal-transportation-infrastructure-investment.

Some members of Congress want to eliminate federal transportation programs altogether and leave the responsibility to states. Is that a good idea? Absolutely not. States need a strong federal partner to ensure that interstate commerce, international trade policies, interstate passenger travel, emergency preparedness, national defense, and global competitiveness are adequately supported by the nation’s infrastructure. Without federal support for an interconnected transportation system, several large, less-populated rural states would be unable to afford the costs of sustaining their roads and bridges. Many of our nation’s conservative visionaries, including Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Dwight Eisenhower, and Ronald Reagan, understood the proper role of the federal government in meeting these needs, as Pete Ruane, president of the American Road and Transportation Builders Association, notes in today’s Washington Times. Even today, some of the most vocal opponents of federal spending recognize the importance of transportation investment. Rep. Paul Ryan points out in A Roadmap for America’s Future that transportation is a core government responsibility: “Governments must provide for a limited set of public goods: they must build roads and other infrastructure, foster the protection of property rights, and maintain internal and external security… this ‘core’ government spending tends to foster economic growth.”

#### Federal action key to infrastructure quality across the nation

Association for General Contractors of America, May-2011, “The Case for Infrastructure & Reform,” http://www.agc.org/galleries/news/Case-for-Infrastructure-Reform.pdf.

In other cases, the federal government has an obligation to invest in infrastructure to avoid imposing costs on U.S. businesses and imposing unfunded mandates on state and local governments. For example, local governments had long been responsible for paying to maintain and operate water systems. That meant only major cities and wealthy towns had access to modern water systems. Much of that changed when the federal government began mandating quality standards for drinking water and wastewater discharge through legislation like the Clean Water Act and Safe Drinking Water Act. These standards were in the best interest of the nation, ensuring protection of public health and environmental quality. By mandating quality standards, however, the federal government forces local governments to spend billions of dollars to upgrade equipment and comply with regulatory burdens. The federal government must not foist the burden of maintaining national standards onto local ratepayers alone. Given that it is in the federal interest to set water quality standards, then so too must it be in the federal interest to provide – primarily in the form of state revolving loan funds – financing help to operators so they can meet those standards.

#### States fail at infrastructure maintenance

John Hood is president of the John Locke Foundation, Winter-2011, “The States in Crisis,” http://www.nationalaffairs.com/publications/detail/the-states-in-crisis.

As a result, while the number, size, and market value of state and local buildings and facilities have increased dramatically over the past two decades, budgets for maintenance, repair, and renovation have not kept pace. Many public buildings have thus ceased to become local-government assets, becoming instead additional unfunded liabilities that will consume a great deal of money not currently acknowledged in state budget projections. According to another Pew Center study in 2008, only six states — Florida, Indiana, Nebraska, Texas, Utah, and Vermont — had adequate infrastructure-maintenance policies. Twenty-two states got failing grades for infrastructure, including familiar mismanagement case studies like Illinois and New Jersey.

### States Invest in Bad Infrastructure

#### State invest in the least efficient infrastructures

John Hood is president of the John Locke Foundation, Winter-2011, “The States in Crisis,” http://www.nationalaffairs.com/publications/detail/the-states-in-crisis.

This funding shortage for America's roads may seem surprising, given the astronomical amounts of government money spent on transportation. The reason is that a large — and egregiously wasteful — chunk of state and local transportation budgets is devoted to obsolete transit and rail programs, which seek to apply the leading technologies of 1900 to the mobility needs of 2011. Because much of the money for these projects ultimately comes from the federal government — in the form of highway bills and other pork-laden legislation — the funding dynamic that governs transportation is similar to the one that obtains with Medicaid. The fact that only a fraction of the money comes from locally raised taxes gives state and local politicians significant incentive to pursue transportation projects that would make no sense in the absence of federal largesse. But in order to get the federal money for transit projects, state and local authorities must invest some of their own revenues — often in significant amounts. So the lure of federal money for rail programs often ratchets up state and local transit spending.

#### States are bad at managing infrastructure needs

John Hood is president of the John Locke Foundation, Winter-2011, “The States in Crisis,” http://www.nationalaffairs.com/publications/detail/the-states-in-crisis.

This phenomenon is evident not only in the states' management of financial capital, but also in their approach to physical capital. It is far more exciting for politicians to break ground on new buildings and infrastructure than it is to commit state dollars to the maintenance, repair, and renovation of facilities already in use. New construction signifies growth, progress, and expanded access to popular services like education and transportation. Fixing up old facilities is rarely front-page news. Public administrators have thus fallen into the habit of letting facilities problems fester, putting together capital plans that focus on new construction rather than repair or maintenance. The private sector, too, is a party to the scheme: After all, developers, contractors, and tradesmen typically enjoy far higher profit margins from new construction than they receive from maintenance and repair. Members of these professions — and the unions that represent them — simply add pressure in state capitals to build anew rather than maintain the old.

#### States misspend their money

David A. Graham is a reporter for Newsweek, Feb-3-2011, “Which States Squandered Their Stimulus Money?,” <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2011/02/03/> infrastructures-stimulus-spendthrifts.html.

A new study shows that most states didn’t end up making the most of the windfall. The report by the transportation research group Smart Growth America found that states spent more than a third of the money on building new roads—rather than working on public transportation and fixing up existing roads and bridges. The result of the indiscriminate spending? States missed out on potentially thousands of new jobs—and bridges, roads, and overpasses around the country are still crumbling. Meanwhile, the states that did put dollars toward public transportation were richly rewarded: Each dollar used on transit was 75 percent more effective at putting people to work than a dollar used for highway work. The government meant to get the biggest bang for its buck, with “shovel-ready projects.” But building miles of new roads requires planning, land acquisition, and other lengthy steps that put fewer workers on the job immediately.

### States Have No Money for Infrastructure

#### States are too broke to solve

Urban Land Institute and Ernst & Young, 2011, “Infrastructure 2011: A Strategic Priority,” <http://www.uli.org/sitecore/content/ULI2Home/News/PressReleases/> Archives/2011/2011PressReleases/~/media/Documents/ResearchAndPublications/Reports/Infrastructure/Infrastructure2011.ashx.

Congress’s apparent inclination to curtail federal infrastructure funding will effectively push more of the cost burden onto already “budget-busted” states and local governments, “which can’t afford to do much without federal help.” Available federal funding, meanwhile, continues to favor capital projects rather than operations and maintenance. As a result: n Road systems and water treatment plans built with federal grants 40 or 50 years ago reach the end of their life cycles, and now many counties and towns do not have the wherewithal to repair or replace them. n local governments often are left to grab for dwindling available federal capital project dollars when starved for maintenance and operational funding on existing systems. n More states reject available federal capital funding, fearing future unfunded operating burdens. n Some innovative plans to expand transit systems in car-dependent metro areas struggle to move forward; local governments and agencies cannot make up the difference as federal funds peter out.

#### States don’t have the money

AECOM Technology Corporation, Mar-30-2011, “U.S. Infrastructure: Ignore the Need or Retake the Lead?” http://www.aecom.com/deployedfiles/Internet/Brochures/ AECOM\_ACEC%20white%20paper\_v3.pdf.

Meanwhile, states continue to experience cuts in transportation-related and public works budgets for the foreseeable future. Adding pressure, a potential increase in municipal bond defaults threatens to dampen investor enthusiasm for what has been a widely successful financing tool for state and local projects. Even if widespread municipal bond defaults are unlikely, the cost of capital will assuredly increase to reflect a risk premium.

#### States don’t have the money for infrastructure

Donald F. Kettl is the Potomac Chronicle columnist for GOVERNING. He is the dean of the School of Public Policy at the University of Maryland and a nonresident senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, Apr-2010, “The Looming Infrastructure Crisis,” Governing, http://www.governing.com/columns/potomac-chronicle/The-Looming-Infrastructure-Crisis.html.

The problem isn't just devilish. It's stuck in a devil's triangle of cross-pressures conspiring to make a solution incredibly tough. On one side of the triangle is the deep and ongoing state budget crisis. Job recovery from the Great Recession is slow, and so too is the revival in state revenues. Medicaid continues to drain state budgets, and the hemorrhage is increasing as aging baby boomers begin drifting into government-funded nursing homes. Rising public debt, especially from the feds, threatens to crowd out other spending. The Center for Best Practices at the National Governors Association pointed to the risk of a "lost decade" for state government, with an ongoing budget crunch hanging state policy. It's time, the center warned, to redesign "state government for the new normal." Will this new normal have room for infrastructure repair before more bridges crumple, roads crumble and mass transit stumbles?

### States Can’t Coordinate

#### States fight over infrastructure that crosses state lines

The Economist, Apr-28-2011, “Life in the slow lane,” <http://www.economist.com/node/18620944>.

States can make bad planners. Big metropolitan areas—Chicago, New York and Washington among them—often sprawl across state lines. State governments frequently bicker over how (and how much) to invest. Facing tight budget constraints, New Jersey’s Republican governor, Chris Christie, recently scuttled a large project to expand the railway network into New York City. New Jersey commuter trains share a 100-year-old tunnel with Amtrak, a major bottleneck. Mr Christie’s decision was widely criticised for short-sightedness; but New Jersey faced cost overruns that in a better system should have been shared with other potential beneficiaries all along the north-eastern corridor. Regional planning could help to avoid problems like this.

#### States are unreliable partners

John Hood is president of the John Locke Foundation, Winter-2011, “The States in Crisis,” http://www.nationalaffairs.com/publications/detail/the-states-in-crisis.

A recent example of this phenomenon is the situation surrounding New Jersey governor Chris Christie's decision to cancel a rail-tunnel project that would have provided an additional link between the Garden State and New York City. Much of the opposition to the governor's decision stemmed from the argument that New Jersey would lose out on federal backing — the federal government and the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey were to provide $3 billion each for the project, and the state of New Jersey was on the hook for $2.7 billion, plus any cost overruns. It was when those overruns were projected to be between $1 billion and $5 billion that Christie pulled the plug, arguing that the burden was too much for the state to bear.

#### States compete for business investment

Joshua Newman, Dec-22-2011, “We Need Political Collaboration to Fix Our Transportation Infrastructure,” Triple Pundit, http://www.triplepundit.com/2011/12/dont-like-whats-happening-washington-start-2/.

It is increasingly apparent that America will suffer competitive losses in the global marketplace if we do not address our aging transportation infrastructure. The private sector can’t address this problem alone – government can and should provide much-needed financing, as well as coordination across county and state lines. The way things are now, local and state governments compete for federal resources and to convince businesses to locate in their jurisdictions. Competition is good, because it often promotes efficiency in service delivery, but too much of anything can lead to problems elsewhere. For example, many of our highways are in a shocking state of disrepair, and in order to maintain, at best, a slow rate of decline, some estimate that we’ll need nearly $12 billion in additional annual investments in highways alone. If we actually want to enhance these and other systems, another $50 billion annually could be justified. If that sounds absurd, think again, and that statistic does not even include investments needed to maintain and modernize other infrastructure elements, such as the electrical grid, train systems, and other critical components of the American economy.

### Permutation Solves

#### Federal and state government can work together to solve

Edward Glaeser, an economics professor at Harvard University, is a Bloomberg View columnist, Feb-13-2012, “Spending Won’t Fix What Ails U.S. Infrastructure: Edward Glaeser,” Bloomberg, http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-02-14/spending-won-t-fix-what-ails-u-s-transport-commentary-by-edward-glaeser.html.

INSTITUTIONALIZE MAINTENANCE FUNDING: Throughout the world, political leaders love to cut ribbons on new projects, but they hate the hard work of maintaining older infrastructure. The natural result is that bridges become unsafe and highways are riddled with potholes. As I suspect that states and localities will always do too little to invest in maintenance, this would be a good place to redirect federal spending.

Instead of funding new projects, the Highway Trust Fund could instead become solely a road and bridge maintenance fund. Obama’s 2013 budget moves in this direction by espousing a “fix-it-first policy,” but that isn’t the same as tying future tax revenue to needed maintenance. New projects would be funded in-state, but federal money could only be used to keep our current system working. States would receive gas-tax revenue paid only by drivers on their own roads to cover needed maintenance expenditures. Ideally, if maintenance needs are below gas taxes, then federal gas taxes in that state would be cut accordingly. The federal government would monitor infrastructure quality and use its funding to ensure that standards were kept high.

#### Federal-state partnership solves transportation infrastructure

Donald F. Kettl is the Potomac Chronicle columnist for GOVERNING. He is the dean of the School of Public Policy at the University of Maryland and a nonresident senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, Apr-2010, “The Looming Infrastructure Crisis,” Governing, http://www.governing.com/columns/potomac-chronicle/The-Looming-Infrastructure-Crisis.html.

The two strategies are related, but haven't run parallel. That's made it hard for the transportation department to set a clear course through the devil's triangle. And in both cases, the national strategies are miles above the bridge, roads, buses and subways below. That's made it hard for the feds to link their broad strategies to the operating realities of state and local infrastructure managers. Most of the nation's transportation system is a federal-state-local hybrid. The feds provided most of the funds to build the original interstate system, create mass transit systems, and help with highway and bridge repair. But the feds have sidestepped the big question of how much of the looming infrastructure problem they want to own--and fund.

### States Counterplan Bad Theory

#### 1. The counterplan is plan-inclusive. Since the counterplan includes the majority of the plan, it doesn’t prove that the plan is a bad idea. Plan-inclusive counterplans discourage substantive education about the implications of increasing social services.

#### 2. The counterplan fiats multiple different governmental agencies. Reject multi-actor fiat because no single judge has the power to make the decisions of multiple state governmental officials. This doesn’t link to the affirmative because we fiat the single government in the District of Colombia – the federal government.

#### 3. The counterplan is unpredictable. There is no author that writes that all 50 states should implement a uniform change in social services through the NCCUSL. Since there is no solvency advocate, it is impossible for the affirmative to prepare because no one writes counter-arguments. This is especially true since judges rely heavily on evidence to determine argumentative quality.

#### 4. The counterplan is not a rational test of opportunity cost. Since the federal government acting does not prevent in any way the states from acting, the counterplan itself does not test whether the affirmative is a good idea. The net-benefits could be stand-alone and actually test the desirability of the plan.

#### 5. Err affirmative on theory. The negative gets the block, tons of other generic arguments like Kritiks and topicality, and the 1ar is the hardest speech in debate because of the comparative time differential with the negative block.

#### 6. This is a reason to reject the team, not just the argument. The only way to deter against illegitimate counterplans is to create a community consensus that running them will have penalties outside of mere rejection of that counterplan. Voting against the team sets a clear standard against states counterplans. Also, the damage is already done. We have had to invest time in this theory argument, which has a tradeoff with other arguments.

### AT: Federalism NB

Infrastructure is a federal responsibility

Association for General Contractors of America, May-2011, “The Case for Infrastructure & Reform,” http://www.agc.org/galleries/news/Case-for-Infrastructure-Reform.pdf.

The answer is that it is clearly in the national interest to invest in infrastructure. For example, there is a clear, constitutionally defined federal role for supporting interstate commerce by investing in transportation infrastructure. Likewise, there is a strong argument to be made that the federal government has a vital role to play in maintaining our national economic security by investing in the infrastructure that is vital to commerce. Indeed, the Constitution is quite clear that it is the responsibility of the federal government to facilitate interstate commerce. Today, the vast majority of that interstate commerce travels on America’s vast, interconnected network of highways, airports and waterways. That means that if Congress and the Administration want to fulfill their Constitutional obligation to facilitate interstate commerce, they must continue to make the investments needed to maintain sufficient quality and capacity along our interstate highway network, our waterways and ensure the safety of air travelers.

#### Transportation infrastructure policy is a federal-state hybrid

Donald F. Kettl is the Potomac Chronicle columnist for GOVERNING. He is the dean of the School of Public Policy at the University of Maryland and a nonresident senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, Apr-2010, “The Looming Infrastructure Crisis,” Governing, http://www.governing.com/columns/potomac-chronicle/The-Looming-Infrastructure-Crisis.html.

The two strategies are related, but haven't run parallel. That's made it hard for the transportation department to set a clear course through the devil's triangle. And in both cases, the national strategies are miles above the bridge, roads, buses and subways below. That's made it hard for the feds to link their broad strategies to the operating realities of state and local infrastructure managers. Most of the nation's transportation system is a federal-state-local hybrid. The feds provided most of the funds to build the original interstate system, create mass transit systems, and help with highway and bridge repair. But the feds have sidestepped the big question of how much of the looming infrastructure problem they want to own--and fund.

#### Authority over infrastructure is shared by federal and state governments

Fred Moavenzadeh and Kyle Frazier, Summer 2009, “System at a Crossroads: Rethinking Infrastructure and Mobility,” MIT Faculty Newsletter, http://web.mit.edu/fnl/volume/215/moavenzadeh\_frazier.html.

The difficulty of orchestrating a comprehensive response to this problem is compounded by the structure of the infrastructure enterprises, which are extensively fragmented along multiple dimensions. Authority is held by a mixture of local, state, federal, and regional – or metropolitan – agencies. It is divided according to modes (e.g., air, rail, highway, marine, and pipelines in transportation) and often it is further split among entities responsible for guide-ways and infrastructure, vehicles and rolling stock, system operations, and other functions. Information traditionally has not flowed easily across these boundaries, and decision-making typically allocates resources to achieve localized optimization with poor understanding or little regard for effects on long-term improvements in the larger system. Provision of mobility – and enhancement of its quality – is an issue requiring a comprehensive approach and participation of the many service providers and other stakeholders. Our failure as a nation to adopt such a coordinated and inclusive approach has been a major factor contributing, over the last several decades, not just to a lack of real progress, but also to an actual worsening of service provision by the systems at large.

### AT: Politics NB

#### Infrastructure spending is politically popular

Chris Edwards, director of tax policy studies at the Cato Institute, Oct-21-2011, “Infrastructure projects to fix the economy? Don’t bank on it,” The Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/infrastructure-projects-to-fix-the-economy-dont-bank-on-it/2011/10/18/gIQAgtZi3L\_story.html.

Increased infrastructure spending has significant support in Washington these days. President Obama wants a new federal infrastructure bank, and some members of both parties want to pass big highway and air-traffic-control funding bills. The politicians think these bills will create desperately needed jobs, but the cost of that perceived benefit is too high: Federal infrastructure spending has a long and painful history of pork-barrel politics and bureaucratic bungling, with money often going to wasteful and environmentally damaging projects.

#### Infrastructure spending gets a lot of political support

David A. Graham is a reporter for Newsweek, Feb-3-2011, “Which States Squandered Their Stimulus Money?,” <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2011/02/03/> infrastructures-stimulus-spendthrifts.html.

With President Obama calling for further transportation funding in his State of the Union address last month, the federal government may soon be writing more checks to the states. Although Republicans have pledged to cut spending, House Majority Leader Eric Cantor, who has spoken about the poor state of the nation’s infrastructure, is likely to get on board. Infrastructure spending has traditionally been popular with voters.

#### Even fiscal conservatives support infrastructure spending

Janet Kavinoky, Feb-16-2012, “5 Answered Questions about Federal Transportation Infrastructure Investment,” Free Enterprise, <http://www.freeenterprise.com/> infrastructure/5-answered-questions-about-federal-transportation-infrastructure-investment.

Some members of Congress want to eliminate federal transportation programs altogether and leave the responsibility to states. Is that a good idea? Absolutely not. States need a strong federal partner to ensure that interstate commerce, international trade policies, interstate passenger travel, emergency preparedness, national defense, and global competitiveness are adequately supported by the nation’s infrastructure. Without federal support for an interconnected transportation system, several large, less-populated rural states would be unable to afford the costs of sustaining their roads and bridges. Many of our nation’s conservative visionaries, including Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, Dwight Eisenhower, and Ronald Reagan, understood the proper role of the federal government in meeting these needs, as Pete Ruane, president of the American Road and Transportation Builders Association, notes in today’s Washington Times. Even today, some of the most vocal opponents of federal spending recognize the importance of transportation investment. Rep. Paul Ryan points out in A Roadmap for America’s Future that transportation is a core government responsibility: “Governments must provide for a limited set of public goods: they must build roads and other infrastructure, foster the protection of property rights, and maintain internal and external security… this ‘core’ government spending tends to foster economic growth.”

### AT: Spending NB

#### Federal infrastructure spending adds 40% of value to the economy

Donna Cooper, is a Senior Fellow with the Economic Policy team at American Progress, Feb-16-2012, “Meeting the Infrastructure Imperative,” Center for American Progress, http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2012/02/infrastructure.html.

Among the tools at the government’s disposal to boost jobs, rebuilding our infrastructure is one of the options with the greatest impact. After President Barack Obama proposed the American Jobs Act, Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody’s Analytics, found in 2011 that new federal spending for infrastructure improvements to highways and public schools would generate $1.44 of economic activity for each $1 spent. In reviewing the economic impact of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, the Congressional Budget Office found that infrastructure investments and purchases by the federal government for goods and services had the largest jobs multiplier impact of all the stimulus elements.

#### Infrastructure spending helps the economy

Joseph Lazzaro, Apr-15-2008, “Federal infrastructure spending could gain traction if U.S. recession lingers,” Daily Finance, http://www.bloggingstocks.com/2008/04/15/federal-infrastructure-spending-could-gain-traction-if-u-s-rece/.

Finally, the public infrastructure spending would produce "a most salient result" Wang said -- it would stimulate U.S. economic growth even more than the income tax rebate and investment credit act passed earlier this year. Moreover, given the housing sector's contraction, "it's more than likely that the first economic stimulus will not be sufficient to get the U.S. economy growing again," Wang said. The economy will need another shot in the arm. "From both an infrastructure needs and an economic stimulus standpoint, you can make a strong case for infrastructure spending," Wang said. "Of course, if private sector investment and growth magically returns to robust levels, the case is less strong. But don't look for that anytime soon."

#### Infrastructure spending stimulates the economy

Laura D’Andrea Tyson is a professor at the Haas School of Business at the University of California, Berkeley, and served as chairwoman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Clinton, Oct-21-2011, “The Infrastructure Twofer: Jobs Now and Future Growth,” New York Times, http://economix.blogs.nytimes.com/2011/10/21/the-infrastructure-two-fer-jobs-now-and-future-growth/.

Echoing the views of many economists, the foundation report asserts: “Long-term investment in public infrastructure is the best way to simultaneously create jobs, crowd in private investment, make the economy more productive and generate a multiplier of growth in other sectors of the economy.” In less technical language, the council’s report makes the same point, arguing that infrastructure investment is a “twofer” that creates jobs in the near term and promotes competitiveness and productivity in the long term. Both reports provide sobering evidence of the growing deficiencies of infrastructure in the United States, which millions of Americans experience every day in traffic and airport delays, crumbling and structurally unsafe schools and unreliable train and public transit systems. These deficiencies impose significant costs on the economy. For example, the Department of Transportation estimates that freight bottlenecks cost the American economy about $200 billion a year, the equivalent of more than 1 percent of gross domestic product; the Federal Aviation Administration estimates that air traffic delays cost the economy nearly $33 billion a year.

## State Development K Answers

### No Alternative To Capitalism

#### Capitalism creates reflexivity – solves its own problems

Anne Cudd, Dean of Humanities and Professor of Philosophy @ KU, 2010, “Capitalism for and Against: A Feminist Debate,” pg. 124

Finally, capitalism promotes innovation, and as a path to technical innovation, science. Science offers a means for critical analysis of beliefs, and hence a way to uncover and debunk false consciousness.15 In the quest for a creative, innovative workforce, ideal firms seek out highly educated individuals and individuals from widely varying backgrounds. If a society is to support such innovation, it will need to support the education of individuals from all walks of life in order to maximize the potential for finding the uniquely creative individuals who will invent new technologies and new forms of life. But a necessary byproduct of such broadly distributed education will be the creation of critical thinking individuals who question the fetishes of the current generation. In this way, capitalism creates the conditions for trenchant critiques of capitalist fetishes.

#### No alternative to capitalism --- even socialists agree

Erik Olin Wright, Vilas Distinguished Professor of Sociology at the University of Wisconsin, April 2007, “Guidelines for Envisioning Real Utopias”, Soundings, April, www.ssc.wisc.edu/~wright/Published%20writing/Guidelines-soundings.pdf

To be a radical critic of existing institutions and social structures is to identify harms that are generated by existing arrangements, to formulate alternatives which mitigate those harms, and to propose transformative strategies for realising those alternatives. There was a time when many intellectuals on the left were quite confident in their understanding of each of these: theories of class and political economy provided a framework for identifying what was wrong with capitalism; various contending conceptions of socialism provided models for alternatives; and theories of class struggle and socialist politics (whether reformist or revolutionary) provided the basis for a transformative strategy. Today there is much less certainty among people who still identify strongly with left values of radical egalitarianism and deep democracy. While left intellectuals remain critical of capitalism, many acknowledge - if reluctandy - the necessity of markets and the continuing technological dynamism of capitalism. Socialism remains a marker for an alternative to capitalism, but its close association with statist projects of economic planning no longer has much credibility, and no fully convincing alternative comprehensive model has become btoadly accepted. And while class struggles certainly remain a central source of conflict in the world today, there is no longer confidence in their potential to provide the anchoring agency for transforming and transcending capitalism.

#### Capitalism inevitable – evolution

Ellen Wood, Ph.D in political science from UCLA, 2002, The Origin of Capitalism, pg. 4-6

These question-begging explanations have their origina in classical political economy and Enlightenment conceptions of progress. Together, they give an account of historical development in which the mergence and growth to maturity of capitalism are already prefigured in the earliest manifestations of human rationality, in the technological advances that began when Homo Sapiens first wielded a tool, and in the acts of exchange human beings have practised since time immemorial. History’s journey to that final destination, to ‘commercial society’ or capitalism, has, to be sure, been long and arduous, and many obstacles hace stood in its way. But its progress has nonetheless been natural and inevtiable. Nothing more is required, then, to explain the ‘rise of capitalism’ than an account of how many obstacles to its forward movement have been lifted- sometimes gradually, sometimes suddenly, with revolutionary violence.

### Capitalism Inevitable

#### Capitalism inevitable – history

Ellen Wood, Ph.D in political science from UCLA, 2002, The Origin of Capitalism, pg. 4-6

In more accounts of capitalism and its origin, there really is no origin. Capitalism seems always to be there, somehwere; and it only needs to be realeased from its chains- for instance, from the fetters of fuedalism- to be allowed to grow and mature. Typically, these fetters are political: the parasitic powers of lordship, or the restrictions of an autocratic state. Sometimes they are cultural or ideological: perhaps the wrong religion. These contraints confine the free movement of ‘economic’ actors, the free expression of econmic rationality. The ‘economic’ in these formulations is identified with exchange or markets; and it is here that we can detect the assumption that the seeds of capitalism are contained in the most primitive acts of exchange, in any form of trade or market activity. That assumption is typically connected

#### Capitalism inevitable – drive for competition

Ellen Wood, Ph.D in political science from UCLA, 2002, The Origin of Capitalism, pg. 4-6

With the other presupposition: that history has been an almost natural process of technological development. One way or another, capitalism more or less naturally appears when and where expanding markets and technological development reach the right level, allowing sufficient wealth to be accumulated so that is can be profitably reinvested. Many Marxist explanations are fundamentally the same- with the addition of bourgeois revolutions to help break the fetters.

#### Capitalism inevitable – profit motive

Ellen Wood, Ph.D in political science from UCLA, 2002, The Origin of Capitalism, pg. 4-6

Central to these conventional accounts of history are certain assumptions, explicit or implicit, about human nature and about how human beings will behave, if only given the chance. They will, so the story goes, always avail themselves of the opportunity to maximize profits through acts of exchange, and in order to realize that natural inclination, they will always find ways of improving the organization and instruments of work in order to enhance the productivity of labor.

### Capitalism Is Resilient

#### Capitalism is inevitable. People will always want to better their lives.

William J. Baumol, Officer of the Kauffman Foundation and a published author by Yale University, 2007, GOOD CAPITALISM, BAD CAPITALISM, AND THE ECONOMIES OF GROWTH AND PROSPERITY

At the bottom, economic growth is essential not because humans are greedy or excessively materialistic, but because they want to better their lives. This is a natural aspiration and only with more economic output can more people live a more enjoyable and satisfying existence. Of course, economic growth is not the only goal in life. As economists will be the first to point out, there are always trade-offs: More work leaves less time for play and for family. More output often is accompanied by an increase in unwelcome side effects, such as pollution. But at the end of the day, the richer societies are, the more resources they will have to address the side effects of growth as well as the various maladies that shorten lives or make them less satisfying.

#### Cap evolves to avoid problems

Peter Saunders, professor emeritus at the Centre for Independent Studies and Adjunct Professor at the Australian Graduate School of Management. He was previously of University of Sussex in England, WHY CAPITALISM IS GOOD FOR THE SOUL, 2007, http://www.cis.org.au/POLICY/summer%2007-08/saunders\_summer07.html

No socioeconomic system can guarantee people a good life. All we can reasonably ask of any society is the conditions that will enable us to construct happy and worthwhile lives for ourselves. On this test, capitalism passes with flying colours. A modern capitalist country like Australia guarantees necessities like food and shelter. By enforcing a clear system of private property rights, it offers individuals security. It allows people to interact freely, forming family ties, friendship groups, and communities of common interest; and it maximises opportunities for people to realise their potential through hard work and innovation. These are the conditions that Abraham Maslow identified as essential for humans to satisfy their core needs. If these conditions are in place, as they are in modern, capitalist countries, no individual can reasonably claim that external conditions have prevented them from pursuing happiness.(20)Traditional critics of capitalism, like Marx, argued that these preconditions of human happiness could not be satisfied in a capitalist society. Marx’s theory of the ‘immiseration of the proletariat’ held that capitalism couldn’t even guarantee provision of food and shelter, for mass poverty, misery, ignorance, and squalor were the inevitable consequence of the accumulation of wealth by a tiny capitalist class.(21) We now know that Marx was spectacularly wrong. Working people today do not just earn a good wage; they own comfortable homes, have shares in the companies that employ them, go to university, win entry to the professions, set up businesses, and run for high office. The western ‘working class’ (to the extent that such a thing still exists) has been so busy expanding its horizons that it has quite forgotten about its historic mission of overthrowing capitalism.

#### Capitalism is adaptive

Will Serwetman, JD Suffolk Law, 1997, http://www.ninjalawyer.com/writing/marx.html

Marx utilizes the Hegelian dialectic in his attempt to prove that capitalism will inevitably collapse from the crisis of overproduction and the class conflict caused by enmiseration and alienation. Capitalism, he felt, would inevitably be replaced by socialism. Marx died waiting for this revolution to come about, and it never has. Even the Russian and Chinese revolutions cannot be viewed as results of capitalism collapsing, nor can they be seen as socialist states because they retain post-revolution ary class structures and are not radical democracies. While Rosa Luxemberg wrote that while the capitalism will inevitably consume itself and that socialism is a possible option, I go so far as to question the Marxist logic that capitalism is doomed to collapse. The capitalist that Marx evokes in his work is only a caricature of the behavior of capitalists and does not reflect reality as history has shown it to be. Successful capitalists are smart enough to plan for long-term profits in addition to the short-term. Like anyone else, they will make mistakes and learn from them. There is a Darwinian process to capitalism, and those unable to account for factors beyond their short-term profits will be replaced by those who can. How many buffalo-fur coat business es do we see? Despite the various crises of the past century, capitalism thrives and shows no major signs of strain.

### Capitalism Is Sustainable

#### Capitalism overcomes consumption problems

Will Serwetman, JD Suffolk Law, 1997, http://www.ninjalawyer.com/writing/marx.html

Despite Marx's predictions, capitalism is perfectly capable of inventing new markets to replace saturated ones. If stereo manufacturers can no longer find a market for their goods, they close down and invest their money in a new industry, such as cable television or computers. The crisis of overproduction will never happen because capitalism is flexible and will sacrifice it's short t rm goals to achieve its long term ones. Marx also never took into account the effect government regulation and welfare would have on the capitalist system. Any business naturally desires monopolies over its markets, but when that is achieved, the consequences are disastrous. The final stage of capitalism, in which trusts and monopolies prevent the economy from running naturally and efficiently, has been prevented by legislation and unionization. None of the problems Marx predicted are unavoidable as long as we do not sink to the level of sharks.

#### Capitalism can modify into a mixed economy – ensures its sustainability

Charles Noble, chair of the department of Political Science and director of the international studies program at the California State University, 2003, Why Capitalism Needs the Left, http://www.logosjournal.com/noble.htm

In combination, free market and capitalism have also helped usher in and sustain fundamental political changes, widening the scope both of personal freedom and political democracy. Because of this system, more people get to choose where to work, what to consume, and what to make than ever before, while ancient inequalities of rank and status are overturned. The spread of market capitalism has also laid the foundation for the expansion of democratic decision-making. With the establishment of private property and free exchange, political movements demanding other freedoms, including wider access to government, have proliferated. To be sure, capitalism cannot guarantee personal liberty or political democracy. It has produced it share of dictatorships too. But, to date, no society has been able to establish and maintain political democracy without first establishing and securing a market capitalist system. The large corporations that stand at the heart of contemporary capitalism have proven indispensable in this transformation.

#### Mixed economy prevents collapse

Charles Noble, chair of the department of Political Science and director of the international studies program at the California State University, 2003, Why Capitalism Needs the Left, http://www.logosjournal.com/noble.htm

They are the essential intermediaries in the modern economy, linking financial capital, expertise, technology, managerial skill, labor and leadership. They are spreading everywhere in the world not only because they are powerful, but also because they work. But market capitalism is not a machine that can run on its own. It needs rules, limits, and above all else stewardship. Partly because the system feeds off of people's darker instincts, partly because it is a machine, and therefore indifferent to human values, and partly because there is no central planner to assure that everything works out in the end, there must be some conscious effort to bring order to this chaos, however creative it might be. Left to its own devices, unfettered capitalism produces great inequities, great suffering, and great instability. In fact, these in-built tendencies are enough to destroy the system itself. Karl Marx figured this out in the mid-19th century and built his revolutionary system on the expectation that these dark forces would prevail. But Marx underestimated our ability to use politics to impose limits on the economic system itself. At one time, and still in other places, even conservatives knew this to be true, and offered themselves up as responsible social stewards. Whether out of a sense of noblesse oblige or enlightened self interest, they volunteered to lead a collective effort to reform the system so that capitalism could survive and continue to serve human interests. From the 1930s through the 1970s, American corporate leaders and a fair number of Republicans seemed to understand this too. They made their piece with "big" government, seeing in the New Deal and even the Great Society a way to forge both social peace and political stability through the creation of a "mixed" economy.

### Perm Solves

#### Concrete demand combined with critique of capitalism is key

Nicole Jones, Staff Writer, 11-11-2011, “Žižek On Occupy Wall Street And Future Alternatives,” PBH, http://www.prosebeforehos.com/article-of-the-day/11/11/zizek-on-occupy-wall-street-and-future-alternatives/

One of the strategies [for doing] something concrete is to pick very carefully issues for which you fight, and then try to organize a popular movement. Which have two features: First, they are realistic. But at the same time, [they have] dramatic points which are extremely penetrated by ideology. So things which are absolutely possible but are unacceptable for ideology frame — like healthcare, universal healthcare — this is, I think, maybe the thing to do at this point, apart from laying the foundations, getting ready.

#### Concrete solutions are key

Peter Dickens Visiting Professor of Sociology at the University of Essex and James Ormrod, Lecturer in Sociology at the University of Brighton, 2007, Cosmic Society: Towards a Sociology of the Universe pg 148

Explanatory critique can only go so far. Philosophy and sociology are only tools for uncovering how reality is structured and for freeing up the discussion of feasible alternatives. It will take much hard work and politics on a mass scale to forge new social alliances, counter-hegemonic ideologies and space projects that benefit oppressed populations. The ultimate aim of this must be a relationship with the universe that does not further empower the already powerful.

#### Combining methods is key

Peter Dickens Visiting Professor of Sociology at the University of Essex and James Ormrod, Lecturer in Sociology at the University of Brighton, 2007, Cosmic Society: Towards a Sociology of the Universe pg 148

The physical and natural sciences have often historically denied that their attempts to know the realities with which they are concerned are in any way dependent on the social world. The ideal of science is of an objective discipline that is value-free and guided by its own criteria of progress. The social influences on the theories and methods of science are therefore ignored. Likewise, in the social sciences in the last few decades there has often been a suggestion that our understandings of the physical and natural worlds are mere social constructions, a product of the society in which they were created, thus privileging the kind of knowledge held by the social sciences over that of other disciplines. But as Bruno Latour says, whilst explaining the importance of material reality, ‘it is hard to reduce the entire cosmos to a grand narrative, the physics of subatomic particles to a text, subway systems to rhetorical devices, all social structures to discourse’ (Latour 1993: 64). We maintain that, in order to understand the dialectic between social and physical worlds, an ontology is necessary that explains how insights from both the social and physical sciences can be combined. We recognize that causal mechanisms operate on a number of different levels within the universe, and argue that the job of the social scientist is to work with the knowledge produced by physicists and the like, combining that with sociological understanding. The result of this should be a theory that reduces the universe to neither the merely physical nor the purely social. These points are related to the fundamental tenets of critical realism as outlined by Roy Bhaskar and others (Bhaskar 1986, 1997, 1998; Archer et al. 1998) (see Box 1.1). Unfortunately, the ongoing attempt by scientists to construct a theory of everything runs counter to this kind of ontology.

### Cap Good – General

#### Cap Solves all global problems

Johan Norberg, Fellow at Timbro and CATO, 2003, In Defense of Global Capitalism, pg. 98

Capitalism is not a perfect system, and it is not good for everyone all the time. Critics of globalization are good at pointing out individual harms—a factory that has closed down, a wage that has been reduced. Such things do happen, but by concentrating solely on individual instances, one may miss the larger reality of how a political or economic system generally works and what fantastic values it confers on the great majority compared with other alternatives. Problems are found in every political and economic system, but rejecting all systems is not an option. Hunting down negative examples of what can happen in a market economy is easy enough. By that method water or fire can be proved to be bad things, because some people drown and some get burned to death, but this isn't the full picture. A myopic focus on capitalism's imperfections ignores the freedom and independence that it confers on people who have never experienced anything but oppression. It also disregards the calm and steady progress that is the basic rule of a society with a market economy. There is nothing wrong with identifying problems and mishaps in a predominantly successful system if one does so with the constructive intent of rectifying or alleviating them. But someone who condemns the system as such is obligated to answer this question: What political and economic system could manage things better? Never before in human history has prosperity grown so rapidly and poverty declined so heavily. Is there any evidence, either in history or in the world around us, to suggest that another system could do as well?

#### Capitalism is key for peace – business prevents conflict

Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, 11-15-2005, Spreading Capitalism is Good for Peace, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=5193 \

If market critics don't realize the obvious economic and philosophical value of markets - prosperity and freedom - they should appreciate the unintended peace dividend. Trade encourages prosperity and stability; technological innovation reduces the financial value of conquest; globalization creates economic interdependence, increasing the cost of war. Nothing is certain in life, and people are motivated by far more than economics. But it turns out that peace is good business. And capitalism is good for peace.

#### Cap correlates with peace

Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, 11-15-2005, Spreading Capitalism is Good for Peace, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=5193 \

In particular, poorer democracies perform like non-democracies. By his calculation, the correlation between economic liberty and peace is 50 times as great as that between democracy and peace. He explains: "Democracy does not have a measurable impact, while nations with very low levels of economic freedom are 14 times more prone to conflict than those with very high levels." Gartzke considers other variables, including alliance memberships, nuclear deterrence, and regional differences. Although the causes of conflict vary, the relationship between economic liberty and peace remains.

### Cap Good – War

#### War predates capitalism

D.W. MacKenzie, graduate student in economics at George Mason University, 4-7-2003, “Does Capitalism Require War?” http://mises.org/daily/1201

History is rife with examples of imperialism. The Romans, Alexander, and many others of the ancient world waged imperialistic wars. The Incan Empire and the empire of Ancient China stand as examples of the universal character of imperialism. Who could possibly claim that imperialism grew out of the prosperity of these ancient civilizations? Imperialism precedes modern industrial capitalism by many centuries. Uneven wealth distribution or underconsumption under capitalism obviously did not cause these instances of imperialism. Of course, this fact does not prove that modern capitalism lacks its own imperialistic tendencies.

#### Cap solves war

D.W. MacKenzie, graduate student in economics at George Mason University, 4-7-2003, “Does Capitalism Require War?” http://mises.org/daily/1201

Capitalism neither requires nor promotes imperialist expansion. Capitalism did not create imperialism or warfare. Warlike societies predate societies with secure private property. The idea that inequity or underspending give rise to militarism lacks any rational basis. Imperialistic tendencies exist due to ethnic and nationalistic bigotries, and the want for power. Prosperity depends upon our ability to prevent destructive acts. The dogma of destructive creation fails as a silver lining to the cloud of warfare. Destructive acts entail real costs that diminish available opportunities.

#### Capitalism abhors war

D.W. MacKenzie, graduate student in economics at George Mason University, 4-7-2003, “Does Capitalism Require War?” http://mises.org/daily/1201

The idea that we need to find work for idle hands in capitalism at best leads to a kind of Sisyphus economy where unproductive industries garner subsidies from productive people. At worst, it serves as a supporting argument for war. The more recent versions of the false charges against capitalism do nothing to invalidate two simple facts. Capitalism generates prosperity by creating new products. War inflicts poverty by destroying existing wealth. There is no sound reason to think otherwise.

### Cap Good – War

#### Capitalism solves war

Anne Cudd, Dean of Humanities and Professor of Philosophy @ KU, 2010, “Capitalism for and Against: A Feminist Debate,” pg. 124

Does capitalism cause more wars? This has long been an argument of socialists against capitalism, but it seems a flimsy one. First, it is clear that the communist experiments of the twentieth century were every bit as militaristic and capable of aggressive wars as the capitalist ones. Second, it is commonly asserted, and I think Professor Holmstrom would agree, that democratic nations do not wage war against each other. But democratic countries tend toward capitalism, since that seems to be what people choose when given the chance. As with slavery, the logic of capitalism tells against war, in general, as that wipes out potential trading partners. Capitalist competition is a positive-sum game, not a zero or negative sum. I agree wholeheartedly with Professor Holmstrom's assertion that security is than broader military security; the security of persons and property generally is the necessary condition for capitalist development.

#### Capitalism is key to peace – markets decrease the potential for war

Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, 11-15-2005, Spreading Capitalism is Good for Peace, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=5193

In a world that seems constantly aflame, one naturally asks: What causes peace? Many people, including U.S. President George W. Bush, hope that spreading democracy will discourage war. But new research suggests that expanding free markets is a far more important factor, leading to what Columbia University's Erik Gartzke calls a "capitalist peace." It's a reason for even the left to support free markets. The capitalist peace theory isn't new: Montesquieu and Adam Smith believed in it. Many of Britain's classical liberals, such as Richard Cobden, pushed free markets while opposing imperialism. But World War I demonstrated that increased trade was not enough. The prospect of economic ruin did not prevent rampant nationalism, ethnic hatred, and security fears from trumping the power of markets. An even greater conflict followed a generation later. Thankfully, World War II left war essentially unthinkable among leading industrialized - and democratic - states. Support grew for the argument, going back to Immanual Kant, that republics are less warlike than other systems. Today's corollary is that creating democracies out of dictatorships will reduce conflict. This contention animated some support outside as well as inside the United States for the invasion of Iraq. But Gartzke argues that "the 'democratic peace' is a mirage created by the overlap between economic and political freedom." That is, democracies typically have freer economies than do authoritarian states.

#### Capitalism reduces the incentive for war

Doug Bandow, Senior Fellow at the Cato Institute, 11-15-2005, Spreading Capitalism is Good for Peace, http://www.cato.org/pub\_display.php?pub\_id=5193 \

The shift from statist mercantilism to high-tech capitalism has transformed the economics behind war. Markets generate economic opportunities that make war less desirable. Territorial aggrandizement no longer provides the best path to riches. Free-flowing capital markets and other aspects of globalization simultaneously draw nations together and raise the economic price of military conflict. Moreover, sanctions, which interfere with economic prosperity, provides a coercive step short of war to achieve foreign policy ends.

### AT: Cap Immoral

#### Cap creates morality

Arthur Brooks, Professor of business @ Syracuse, and Peter Wehner, Professor of business @ Syracuse, Center, “Human Nature and Capitalism,” 12-11-2010, The American, http://www.american.com/archive/2010/december/human-nature-and-capitalism

A free market can also better our moral condition—not dramatically and not always, but often enough. It places a premium on thrift, savings, and investment. And capitalism, when functioning properly, penalizes certain kinds of behavior—bribery, corruption, and lawlessness among them—because citizens in a free-market society have a huge stake in discouraging such behavior, which is a poison-tipped dagger aimed straight at the heart of prosperity. In addition, capitalism can act as a civilizing agent. The social critic Irving Kristol argued, correctly in our view, that the early architects of democratic capitalism believed commercial transactions “would themselves constantly refine and enlarge the individual’s sense of his own self-interest, so that in the end the kind of commercial society that was envisaged would be a relatively decent community.”11

#### Supply-side ethics solves a race to the bottom

Robert Bradley, PhD in Political Economy, M.A. in Economics, 2009, “Capitalism at Work: Business, Government and Energy,” pg. 319

Capitalism at Work has described how Malthusian and neo-Malthusian thinking has repeatedly led to false alarms and promiscuous calls for government energy planning. This book has advanced the thesis that complex regulation in place of simple-rules capitalism disrupts market processes and corrupts busi- ness incentives. What is perhaps more important, Capitalism at Work has argued that free enterprise is a system that is not only superbly wealth creating but also morally superior to coercion-based alternatives. It is ethical because it is based on the self-love of Adam Smith, the self-help of Samuel Smiles, and the rational self-interest of Ayn Rand. Yet far from being atomistic or amoral, capitalism driven by self-interest is an intensely sociable system; its supply-side ethics rewards society's wealth creators, person by person, thus creating goodwill and empowering philanthropy. From the innumerable parts comes a robust civil society, its individuals dually directed, as it were, by the economic invisible hand of markets and the moral invisible hand of human benevolence. In the post-Enron world, capitalism deserves a second look by even its most trenchant and intransigent critics.

#### Cap ensures value to life

Robert Tracinski, editor of the Intellectual Activist, 2008, The Moral and the Practical, http://www.moraldefense.com/Philosophy/Essays/The\_Moral\_and\_the\_Practical.htm

Stated in more fundamental terms, capitalism is practical because it relies on the inexhaustible motive-power of self-interest. Under capitalism, people are driven by loyalty to their own goals and by the ambition to improve their lives. They are driven by the idea that one's own life is an irreplaceable value not to be sacrificed or wasted. But this is also a crucial moral principle: the principle that each man is an end in himself, not a mere cog in the collective machine to be exploited for the ends of others. Most of today's intellectuals reflexively condemn self-interest; yet this is the same quality enshrined by our nation's founders when they proclaimed the individual's right to "the pursuit of happiness." It is only capitalism that recognizes this right. The fundamental characteristics that make capitalism practical—its respect for the freedom of the mind and for the sanctity of the individual—are also profound moral ideals. This is the answer to the dilemma of the moral vs. the practical. The answer is that capitalism is a system of virtue—the virtues of rational thought, productive work, and pride in the value of one's own person. The reward for these virtues—and for the political system that protects and encourages them—is an ever-increasing wealth and prosperity.

### AT: Your Epistemology is Flawed

#### Their evidence overstates its findings.

Peter Saunders, Adjunct Professor at the Australian Graduate School of Management, 2007, Why Capitalism is Good for the Soul, http://www.cis.org.au/POLICY/summer%2007-08/saunders\_summer07.html

Andrew Norton notes that disaffected intellectuals since Rousseau have been attacking capitalism for its failure to meet ‘true human needs.’(26) The claim is unfounded, so what is it about capitalism that so upsets them?  Joseph Schumpeter offered part of the answer. He observed that capitalism has brought into being an educated class that has no responsibility for practical affairs, and that this class can only make a mark by criticising the system that feeds them.(27) Intellectuals attack capitalism because that is how they sell books and build careers.   More recently, Robert Nozick has noted that intellectuals spend their childhoods excelling at school, where they occupy the top positions in the hierarchy, only to find later in life that their market value is much lower than they believe they are worth. Seeing ‘mere traders’ enjoying higher pay than them is unbearable, and it generates irreconcilable disaffection with the market system.(28)  But the best explanation for the intellectuals’ distaste for capitalism was offered by Friedrich Hayek in The Fatal Conceit.(29) Hayek understood that capitalism offends intellectual pride, while socialism flatters it. Humans like to believe they can design better systems than those that tradition or evolution have bequeathed.

#### Their authors misunderstand capitalism

Peter Saunders, Adjunct Professor at the Australian Graduate School of Management, 2007, Why Capitalism is Good for the Soul, http://www.cis.org.au/POLICY/summer%2007-08/saunders\_summer07.html

We distrust evolved systems, like markets, which seem to work without intelligent direction according to laws and dynamics that no one fully understands.   Nobody planned the global capitalist system, nobody runs it, and nobody really comprehends it. This particularly offends intellectuals, for capitalism renders them redundant. It gets on perfectly well without them. It does not need them to make it run, to coordinate it, or to redesign it. The intellectual critics of capitalism believe they know what is good for us, but millions of people interacting in the marketplace keep rebuffing them. This, ultimately, is why they believe capitalism is ‘bad for the soul’: it fulfils human needs without first seeking their moral approval.

### Cede The Political

#### Piecemeal reform is key – creates social reform

Robert Bradley, PhD in Political Economy, M.A. in Economics, 2009, “Capitalism at Work: Business, Government and Energy,” pg. 103

There are good revolutions and bad ones. There must be continual improvement, or incrementalism, between sea changes. Often, if not quite always, revolution comes by steps, not bounds. Business thinker Jim Collins enriched the Schumpeter-Drucker-Hamel view by noting how good-to-great companies were disciplined change makers whose entrepreneurship was less about revolutionary moments than revolutionary process. In his words: Good-to-great transformations never happened in one fell swoop. There was no single defining action, no grand program, no one killer innovation, no solitary lucky break, no wrenching revolution. Good to great comes about by a cumulative process—step by step, action by action, decision by decision, turn by turn of the flywheel—that adds up to sustained and spectacular results. Success was “an organic evolutionary process . . . a pattern of buildup leading to breakthrough.” The “doom loop,” noted Collins from his case studies, was “big programs, radical change efforts, dramatic revolutions, chronic restructuring— always looking for a miracle moment or new savior.” Collins saw greatness in disciplined thought and action; failure, in “fads and . . . management hoopla.” There was no silver bullet, no magic, that could substitute for sustained, well- directed effort.

## Capitalism K Answers

### Perm Solves Best

#### Total rejection of capitalism fragments resistance – the perm solves best

J.K. Gibson-Graham, feminist economist, 1996, End of Capitalism

One of our goals as Marxists has been to produce a knowledge of capitalism. Yet as “that which is known,” Capitalism has become the intimate enemy. We have uncloaked the ideologically-clothed, obscure monster, but we have installed a naked and visible monster in its place. In return for our labors of creation, the monster has robbed us of all force. We hear – and find it easy to believe – that the left is in disarray. Part of what produces the disarray of the left is the vision of what the left is arrayed against. When capitalism is represented as a unified system coextensive with the nation or even the world, when it is portrayed as crowding out all other economic forms, when it is allowed to define entire societies, it becomes something that can only be defeated and replaced by a mass collective movement (or by a process of systemic dissolution that such a movement might assist). The revolutionary task of replacing capitalism now seems outmoded and unrealistic, yet we do not seem to have an alternative conception of class transformation to take its place. The old political economic “systems” and “structures” that call forth a vision of revolution as systemic replacement still seem to be dominant in the Marxist political imagination.

#### Total rejection makes the problem worse – perm is more realistic

J.K. Gibson-Graham, feminist economist, 1996, End of Capitalism

The New World Order is often represented as political fragmentation founded upon economic unification. In this vision the economy appears as the last stronghold of unity and singularity in a world of diversity and plurality. But why can’t the economy be fragmented too? If we theorized it as fragmented in the United States, we could being to see a huge state sector (incorporating a variety of forms of appropriation of surplus labor), a very large sector of self-employed and family-based producers (most noncapitalist), a huge household sector (again, quite various in terms of forms of exploitation, with some households moving towards communal or collective appropriation and others operating in a traditional mode in which one adult appropriates surplus labor from another). None of these things is easy to see. If capitalism takes up the available social space, there’s no room for anything else. If capitalism cannot coexist, there’s no possibility of anything else. If capitalism functions as a unity, it cannot be partially or locally replaced. My intent is to help create the discursive conception under which socialist or other noncapitalist construction becomes “realistic” present activity rather than a ludicrous or utopian goal. To achieve this I must smash Capitalism and see it in a thousand pieces. I must make its unity a fantasy, visible as a denial of diversity and change.

#### Perm solves – only using capitalism to fight capitalism can be effective

Monthly Review, March 1990, v. 41, no. 10, p 38

No institution is or ever has been a seamless monolith. Although the inherent mechanism of American capitalism is as you describe it, oriented solely to profit without regard to social consequences, this does not preclude significant portions of that very system from joining forces with the worldwide effort for the salvation of civilization, perhaps even to the extent of furnishing the margin of success for that very effort.

### Capitalist Reformism Is Good

#### Using state-based politics is key to solve the worst excesses of capitalism

Stephen Eric Bronner, Professor of Political Science at Rutgers University, 2004, Reclaiming the Enlightenment: Toward a Politics of Radical Engagement, p. 9-10

Again: the political spirit of the Enlightenment crystallized around the principles connected with fostering the accountability of institutions, reci¬procity under the law, and a commitment to experiment with social reform. Not in imperialism, or racism, or the manipulation of liberty, but in these ideals lies the basis of Enlightenment universalism. Democracy remains an empty word without it. Enlightenment universalism protects rather than threatens the exercise of subjectivity. It presumes to render institutions ac¬countable, a fundamental principle of democracy, and thereby create the preconditions for expanding individual freedom. Such a view would inform liberal movements concerned with civil liberties as well as socialist move¬ments seeking to constrain the power of capital. Reciprocity can be under¬stood in the same way: it, too, underpins the liberal idea of the citizen with its inherently democratic imperative—against all prejudice—to include “the other” as well as the socialist refusal to identify the working person as a mere “cost of production.” The Enlightenment notion of political engagement, indeed, alone keeps democracy fresh and alive. Ideals such as these provide an enduring foundation for opposing con¬temporary infringements on individual rights and dignity by new global forms of capitalism, the imperatives of the culture industry, and parochial bi¬ases of every sort. They constitute the radical quality of the Enlightenment, and its “positive” moment beyond the prejudices of its particular representa¬tives. Too many on the fringes have been forgotten like the proto-socialist Mably or the proto-communist Morelly and, until the appearance of Radical Enlightenment (2001) by Jonathan Israel, even major intellectuals like Spinoza have not received the political recognition that they were due. But this vol¬ume is concerned with something other than uncovering the past. Its intent is instead to reinvigorate the present, salvage the enlightenment legacy, and contest those who would institutionally freeze its radicalism and strip away its protest character. Such an undertaking is important, moreover, since their efforts have been remarkably successful. Enlightenment thinking is seen by many as the inherently western ideology of the bourgeois gentleman, the Ver¬nunftrepublikaner of the Weimar Republic, or characters like the “windbag” Settembrini who endured the sarcasm of totalitarians and the boredom of philistines in The Magic Mountain (1924) by Thomas Mann.

#### Only concrete criticism of social practices can solve

Jim Crosswhite, University of Oregon, September 25, 2001, Critique, Fantasy and September 11, Accessed 4/29/09, http://www.uoregon.edu/~jcross/response\_to\_zizek.htm

And it is difficult to understand what he is asking at the end: "Or will America finally risk stepping through the fantasmatic screen separating it from the Outside World, accepting its arrival into the Real world, making the long-overdue move from 'A thing like this should not happen HERE!' to 'A thing like this should not happen ANYWHERE!'." Of course, to abandon the "here" for the "anywhere" would be foolish. We are in real bodies in real places with real limitations and with real work to do. It is not simply a "fantasmatic screen" that deeply attaches people in a unique way to the sufferings of their neighbors and their fellow citizens. But the demand that Zizek makes is neither unfamiliar nor inappropriate. It is more than worth pursuing. What can we do to work to see that what the people of New York City suffered on September 11 does not happen anywhere,;neither in the U.S. nor anywhere else? The reactions of the American government now threaten regions all over the world and seriously threaten liberty and privacy and tolerance in the United States. The American past carries humanitarian successes and catastrophic failures and genocide. Perhaps fantastic critique has a role to play. Certainly we must struggle to sustain serious social criticism through threatening times, but unless we are simply displaying critical virtuosity, we must achieve a kind of criticism that is reasonably concrete, less pretending to ultimate truths of history, more capable of acknowledging the real suffering of real people, criticism that is not too proud to descend to the practicable.

### Growth Is Sustainable

#### There are no limits to growth – scientists say so

George Melloan, ‘Limits to Growth’; a Dumb Theory That Refuses to Die, WALL STREET JOURNAL, OPINION TUESDAY, AUGUST 27, 2002

Thirty years ago, a group of academic theorists came up with a document almost as subversive as “Das Kapital” or Mao’s little red book, for much the same reasons. It was called, “The Limits to Growth: A Report for the Club of Rome’s Project on the Predica-ment of Mankind.” Like Marx and Mao, the “Limits to Growth” authors had a modest goal: forcing all of us stupid earthlings to become better people. One, Donella Meadows, conceded that saving the earth would require “a fundamental revision of human behavior and, by implication the entire fabric of present-day society.” The need for humankind to become more frugal, less concupiscent and more observant of the rights of small creatures was based on the Club’s conclusion that people are ruining the planet. The warning got attention because we had not long before seen the first view of our blue orb from a camera in outer space. It looked awfully small from that distance. As Jere-miah proved many centuries ago, prophe-cies of doom wake up the congregation. Jimmy Carter, having read “Limits to Growth,” went on TV dressed in a sweater in the late ‘70s to tell Americans that the energy scarcity they were then enduring was good for the soul. They didn’t buy it. Ronald Reagan, espousing deregulation of energy and policies to re-store economic growth, sent Mr. Carter into retirement in 1980. Research by serious economists, demographers and earth scientists debunked the Club of Rome’s theories, finding that there is no danger of the world running out of such essentials as energy or water, and that economic and technological development is good, not bad.

#### Technology fixes can outpace environmental harm

James Gustave Speth, environmental NGO founder, environmental litigator, former think tank head, former environmental advisor to Jimmy Carter, former US Agency for International Development head, 2008 “The Bridge at the Edge of the World: Capitalism, the Environment, and Crossing from Crisis to Sustainability” Yale University Press

A core belief of those who hold that we need not worry about growth per se, because we can green growth to acceptable levels, is that technological change of an environment-saving sort can be driven so rapidly that it more than compensates for the additional environmental stresses growth produces. The well-known “IPAT equation” helps in examining this proposition.7 I=PAT Environmental Impact=Population x Affluence x Technology This equation is actually an identity: Impact=Population x (GDP/Population) x (Impact/GDP) or Impact GDP X (Impact/GDP) where GDP per capita is a measure of affluence and where environ mental impact per dollar of GDP (or unit of output) is a reflection of the technology deployed in the economy. If GDP is going up at 3 percent a year, and if one wants to reduce environmental impacts greatly, then the environmental impacts of each dollar of GDP and each unit of economic output must decline at rates substantially in excess of 3 percent a year. To reduce environmental impacts faster than the economy is growing requires rapid technological change. That is why I and many others have called for policies that promote an environmental revolution in technology—an urgent ecological modernization of the economy that would include both the transformation of existing capital stocks and, through innovation and entrepreneurship, the creation of new environmentally friendly industries, products, and services.8 A major way to reduce pollution and consumption of natural resources while experiencing economic growth is to bring about a wholesale transformation in the technologies that today dominate manufacturing, energy, construction, transportation, and agriculture. The twentieth-century technologies that have contributed so abundantly to today’s problems should be phased out and replaced with twenty-first-century technologies designed with environmental sustainability and restoration in mind. The economy should be “dematerialized” to the fullest possible extent through a new generation of technologies that sharply reduces the consumption of natural resources and the generation of residual wastes per unit of economic output.

### There Are No Limits On Resources

#### No energy or environmental limits to growth – tech innovation solves

Will Wilkinson, Research Fellow at the Cato Institute, 8-4-2008, “No Limits to Growth,” http://www.willwilkinson.net/flybottle/2008/08/04/no-limits-to-growth/

Here is a thumbnail sketch of my position on the sustainability of economic growth. What do you think is wrong with it? (a) energy is not scarce; the historically most efficient sources (oil, coal, etc.) are; (b) a well-functioning price system will shift energy consumption to (cleaner) alternative energy sources as prices for historical extracted sources of energy rise; (c) the initial high price of alternative energy will temporarily slow growth, but competition and technological progress will eventually push prices below the historical trend and even asymptotically approach zero, increasing average rates of growth; (d) environmental quality is a global public good, but; (e) this is most likely to be secured as a consequence of growth — as a consequence of the technological innovation that both creates and is created by growth — together with the rising scarcity and prices of the most environmentally degrading energy sources. So, (f) there are no meaningful limits to growth from either the scarcity of energy, or from negative environmental externalities from economic production, since in the medium run, those externalities are positive.

#### Growth is sustainable – technological advances prove

William J Baumol, professor of economics at NYU, Robert E. Litan, Senior Fellow of Economic Studies at the Brookings Institute, and Carl J. Schramm, President and chief executive officer of the Kauffman Foundation,” 2007, Good Capitalism, Bad Capitalism, and the Economics of Growth and Prosperity

One line of skepticism about growth arises from individuals and groups who worry that as the world’s population increases and economic growth continues, societies will use up scarce resources and, at the same time, degrade the environment. In the early 1970s, a group called the “Club of Rome” expressed such worries, fearing that eventually (and rather soon) the world would run out of energy and some commodities, so that growth couldn’t continue at anything like the existing pace. Today, there are those who believe, for similar reasons, that growth shouldn’t continue. The doomsayers who projected that economic growth would come to a standstill were wrong. Since 1975, total world economic output has increased more than sevenfold.2 On a per capita basis, world output is more than five times higher than it was thirty years ago. Growth in output, and therefore income, per person throughout the world advanced at a far more rapid pace (nearly ninefold) in the twentieth century than in any other century during the previous one thousand years (to the extent these things can be measured).3 Per capita output continues to increase because firms around the world continue to make more use of machines and information technology that enable workers to be more productive and because technology itself continues to advance, making it possible for consumers to use new products and services. There is good reason to hope that this process can and will continue, though there are some lurking dangers, including foolish actions by governments. But should growth continue? What about the supplies of energy that will be depleted in the process or the pollution that will be generated as ever more things are produced and used? Curiously, economists who tend to be quite rational in their lives urge the worriers to have faith—faith that continued technological progress powered by market incentives will ease these concerns. As it turns out, however, economists’ faith has roots in historical fact. In the early 1800s, Thomas R. Malthus famously predicted that the world’s population would eventually starve or, at the least, live at a minimal level of subsistence because food production could not keep pace with the growth of population. Technological advances since that time have proved him wrong. Through better farming techniques, the invention of new farming equipment, and continuing advances in agricultural science (especially the recent “green revolution” led by genetic engineering), food production has increased much more rapidly than population, so much so that in “real terms” (after adjusting for inflation), the price of food is much lower today than it was two hundred years ago, or for that matter, even fifty years ago. Farmers, who once accounted for more than 0 percent of the population at the dawn of the twentieth century in the United States, now comprise less than a percent of population—and are able to grow far more food at the same time.

### Alt Fails – General

#### Alt fails – causes more violence

James Herod 2007, Social Activist and Author, Attended American University of Beirut and University of Kansas, Getting Free: Creating an Association of Democratic Autonomous Neighborhoods, March, http://jamesherod.info/?sec=book&id=1&PHPSESSID=5647f67eacd126ade3dbf1cab7f38ff8

We cannot destroy capitalism with guerrilla warfare. This strategy has been mostly deployed as part of national liberation movements in colonial countries in order to capture the governments there. It is a form of leninism. As noted above, leninism in general didn’t work. And now, guerrilla warfare as a particular tactic within leninism doesn’t work. Capitalists have learned how to defeat it. The strategy was based on the assumed unwillingness of the capitalists to murder the civilian population in order to kill the guerrillas too. Capitalists have shown no such reluctance. They are willing to murder on a massive scale, and uproot and displace whole populations, in order to defeat guerrilla movements. And they win. (The current wars in Colombia and Iraq will perhaps serve as the final test of this strategy.) Some wild-eyed romantic revolutionaries have thought to adopt the strategy for use in the core countries, with disastrous results. Capitalists have been delighted to have a new enemy B namely, Aterrorists@ and Aanarchists@B now that Acommunists@ are gone. But of course they will malign any opposition movement, so this is not the reason guerrilla warfare will not work here. It won’t work because it is part of leninism (seizing state power), and leninism didn’t work. It will not work because of the overwhelming firepower amassed by every advanced capitalist government. It will not work because it doesn’t contain within itself the seeds of the new civilization. I would think twice before joining the underground.

#### Pointing out individual failures of capitalism doesn’t indict the entire system AND they have to provide a working alternative

Johan Norberg, economist, fellow at the Swedish think tank Timbro, recipient of the distinguished Antony Fisher International Memorial Award, 2003, In Defense of Global Capitalism, p. 98

Capitalism is not a perfect system, and it is not good for everyone all the time. Critics of globalization are good at pointing out individual harms—a factory that has closed down, a wage that has been reduced. Such things do happen, but by concentrating solely on individual instances, one may miss the larger reality of how a political or economic system generally works and what fantastic values it confers on the great majority compared with other alternatives. Problems are found in every political and economic system, but rejecting all systems is not an option. Hunting down negative examples of what can happen in a market economy is easy enough. By that method water or fire can be proved to be bad things, because some people drown and some get burned to death, but this isn't the full picture. A myopic focus on capitalism's imperfections ignores the freedom and independence that it confers on people who have never experienced anything but oppression. It also disregards the calm and steady progress that is the basic rule of a society with a market economy. There is nothing wrong with identifying problems and mishaps in a predominantly successful system if one does so with the constructive intent of rectifying or alleviating them. But someone who condemns the system as such is obligated to answer this question: What political and economic system could manage things better? Never before in human history has prosperity grown so rapidly and poverty declined so heavily. Is there any evidence, either in history or in the world around us, to suggest that another system could do as well?

### Alt Fails – Zizek Specific

#### Their alternative is totally ineffective – lack of a specific replacement for the capitalist order causes Nazi Germany

Ernesto Laclau, professor of Political Theory at the University of Essex, 2000, Contingency, Hegemony, Universality, p. 288-

Zizek calls the reader’s attention to the fact that Butler, as well as Laclau, in their criticism of the old ‘essen­tialist’ Marxism, none the less silently accept a set of premisses: they never put in question the fundamentals of the capitalist market economy and of the liberal democratic political regime; they never envisage the possi­bility of a thoroughly different economico-political regime. In this way, they fully participate in the abandonment of these questions by the ‘post­modern’ Left: all the changes they propose are changes within this economico-political regime. (SZ, p. 223) The reader must excuse me for smiling at the naive self-complacence this r-r-revolutionary passage reflects. For if Butler and I are not envis­aging ‘the possibility of a thoroughly different economico-political regime’, Zizek is not doing so either. In his previous essay Zizek had told us that he wanted to overthrow capitalism; now we are served notice that he also wants to do away with liberal democratic regimes — to be replaced, it is true, by a thoroughly different regime which he does not have the courtesy of letting us know anything about. One can only guess. Now, apart from capitalist society and the parallelograms of Mr. Owen, Zizek does actually know a third type of sociopolitical arrange­ment: the Communist bureaucratic regimes of Eastern Europe under which he lived. Is that what he has in mind? Does he want to replace lib­eral democracy by a one-party political system, to undermine the division of powers, to impose the censorship of the press? Zizek belongs to a liberal party in Slovenia, and was its presidential candidate in the first elections after the end of communism. Did he tell the Slovenian voters that his aim was to abolish liberal democracy — a regime which was slowly and painfully established after protracted liberalization cam­paigns in the 1980s, in which Zizek himself was very active? And if what he has in mind is something entirely different, he has the elemen­tary intellectual and political duty to let us know what it is. Hitler and Mussolini also abolished liberal democratic political regimes and replaced them by ‘thoroughly different’ ones. Only if that explanation is made available will we be able to start talking politics, and abandon the theological terrain. Before that, I cannot even know what Zizek is talk­ing about — and the more this exchange progresses, the more suspicious I become that Zizek himself does not know either.

#### Traversing the fantasy is just a hollow buzz-word that reinforces ideology

Bran Nicol, English @ Chichester, Paragraph, July 2001, v. 24, n. 2, p. 152-3

Perhaps there is a note of anxiety in all the compulsive energy of Zizek’s project: he brilliantly unmasks the workings of ideology as if we can overthrow them, but is only too aware that this is impossible. Alternatively, this might well be the source of a certain critical *jouissance* we can detect in his continual affirmation of the unassailable quality of the big Other. In this respect Zizek himself shifts between the hysterical and the perverse positions in his theory: exposing the fragile status of the big Other by questioning it, while also investing in its ultimate status as the Law. Zizek’s very method of exposing the ideological mechanism, in other words, reinforces its inevitability. The paradox bears a strong similarity to Baudrillard’s critique of Marxism in *The Mirror of Production*, that it depends upon precisely the same ideology (the idea of self-production) as the late-capitalist political economy it claims to deconstruct. Zizek’s ubiquitous interpretative mechanism functions as the mirror of the transcendent processes he identifies at the heart of culture. We might even see its status in Zizek’s work as the equivalent of the fundamental fantasy at the core of the individual, supporting his very identity as a theorist. Like Clarice Starling, who thinks she need only rescue one more victim and the lambs will stop crying, it is as if Zizek imagines he need give us just one more example of the traumatic encounter with the real and the dominance of the Big Other will be exposed and overthrown. This, as Hannibal Lecter might say, is no more than a fantasy.

### AT: Capitalism = Root Cause

#### Capitalism isn’t the root cause of our harms

Richard Levin, a professor and American economist who has served as president of Yale University since 1993. He is currently the longest-tenured Ivy League president, 2008 “ACTIVIST POLITICS” AND/OR THE JOB CRISIS IN THE HUMANITIES”, “http://www.theminnesotareview.org/journal/ns48/levin.htm.”

One reason given by Neilson and Meyerson for opposing Bérubé's plan to decrease graduate admissions in the humanities is that it will deprive the rejected students of "a political education, a means by which students learn to read the . . . truths hidden and distorted by capitalist culture" (45: 271, 47: 247). Most liberals would agree that students should learn to "read" hidden or distorted truths and that capitalist culture provides plenty of material to work on, but we'd like to know whether they'll also learn to "read" the truths hidden or distorted by Marxist culture. When they encounter a statement like "capitalism [is] the engine behind global suffering" (47: 242), will they be able to "read" it by asking: was there no suffering before the advent of capitalism? Is there no suffering now in non-capitalist societies? Is capitalism responsible for FGM or AIDS, or the ethnic massacres in Bosnia and Rwanda, or the horrors of Stalin's purges and Mao's Cultural Revolution and Pol Pot's holocaust? And has it had no beneficial effects? If the kind of training that Neilson and Meyerson have in mind doesn't lead students to ask such questions, then they're talking not about political education but about political indoctrination. They're certainly not the only academic leftists to regard indoctrination in Marxism as the proper goal of teaching(Jennifer Cotter says it should "produce knowledges that enable the fundamental transformation of capitalist economic and social relations" (121), and many more examples can be cited. Their usual defense of this practice is to deny the "liberal" distinction between education and indoctrination by arguing that education that claims to be nonpartisan is really indoctrinating for the right. Many people on the far right also deny this distinction, which is why they try to censor the teaching of books with "wrong" ideas: they assume that students will be indoctrinated in these ideas, whereas they want them to be indoctrinated in "right" ideas. This is another similarity of the two political extremes that follows from their polarized perspectives(just as they cannot admit any intermediate positions between the two poles, so they cannot admit any intermediate kind of teaching that doesn't indocrinate for one pole or the other.

#### K isn’t the root cause of the aff – their argument is a generalization

Scott D. Sagan – Department of Political Science, Stanford University – ACCIDENTAL WAR IN THEORY AND PRACTICE – 2000 – available via: www.sscnet.ucla.edu/polisci/faculty/trachtenberg/cv/sagan.doc

To make reasonable judgements in such matters it is essential, in my view, to avoid the common "fallacy of overdetermination." Looking backwards at historical events, it is always tempting to underestimate the importance of the immediate causes of a war and argue that the likelihood of conflict was so high that the war would have broken out sooner or later even without the specific incident that set it off. If taken too far, however, this tendency eliminates the role of contingency in history and diminishes our ability to perceive the alternative pathways that were present to historical actors. The point is perhaps best made through a counterfactual about the Cold War. During the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis, a bizarre false warning incident in the U.S. radar systems facing Cuba led officers at the North American Air Defense Command to believe that the U.S. was under attack and that a nuclear weapon was about to go off in Florida. Now imagine the counterfactual event that this false warning was reported and believed by U.S. leaders and resulted in a U.S. nuclear "retaliation" against the Russians. How would future historians have seen the causes of World War III? One can easily imagine arguments stressing that the war between the U.S. and the USSR was inevitable. War was overdetermined: given the deep political hostility of the two superpowers, the conflicting ideology, the escalating arms race, nuclear war would have occurred eventually. If not during that specific crisis over Cuba, then over the next one in Berlin, or the Middle East, or Korea. From that perspective, focusing on this particular accidental event as a cause of war would be seen as misleading. Yet, we all now know, of course that a nuclear war was neither inevitable nor overdetermined during the Cold War.

### Capitalism Good – Space

#### Capitalist growth makes space travel possible

Nader Elhefnawy, taught at the University of Miami, published widely on space and international issues, Monday, September 29, 2008, “Economic growth and space development over the long haul” http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1220/1

Nonetheless, even if one should not get carried away by seemingly staggering numbers, the fact of higher output still means an enlarged range of options. Just as China’s economic growth has made its new ambitions in space more than just a dream (even if many of its plans have yet to prove to be realistic), a space project of any given size would seem far more affordable in a world where global wealth had risen by a factor of two, three, or five.

#### Growth key to space travel

Nader Elhefnawy, taught at the University of Miami, published widely on space and international issues, Monday, September 29, 2008, “Economic growth and space development over the long haul” http://www.thespacereview.com/article/1220/1

Most discussions of cutting the cost of space development revolve around the price of space launch. This is, of course, understandable, given that this very high cost is a key bottleneck for any space development scheme. Nevertheless, that emphasis also happens to be narrow. Particularly where manned space flight is overly concerned, cheaper must go hand in hand with safer and more reliable. (A manned vehicle with a failure rate of one every fifty launches is not nearly good enough, at any price.) The reduction of the needed payload size to accomplish a given task, which has greatly helped to widen access to satellites, is just as important. The plain truth is that relying on terrestrial economic expansion to endow us with the resources for eventual space expansion will mean admitting the most exciting things are further off than we would like. No less important is the expansion of the economic base that would have to support such endeavors, a point which rarely gets much attention. There is an obvious reason why that approach is often ignored: the common claim that the limits to growth on Earth mandate a turn to the exploitation of space. (Such arguments are not exclusive to the writers of the 1970s. John S. Lewis posits that the failure to do so will mean “civilization collapses to subsistence agriculture by 2030” in his 1996 book Mining the Sky.) However, this is far from being the only reason. The plain truth is that relying on terrestrial economic expansion to endow us with the resources for eventual space expansion will mean admitting the most exciting things are further off than we would like, outside the time frame of “meaningful” discussions of what public policy should be or what private business can do. Besides, it makes for a less compelling and attractive story than the idea of a technological revolution just over the horizon that opens up the heavens to all of us—especially if one is a market romantic when it comes to these matters (see “Market romanticism and the outlook for private space development”, The Space Review, September 2, 2008). Nonetheless, that is what one would have to assume given the state of the art. Additionally, however, while space launch costs (and other, related costs) may drop in real terms in the coming decades, it is safe to say that any viable future spacefaring society will also see them drop markedly in relative terms. The United Nations predicts the rise of Gross World Product (GWP) to about $140 trillion by 2050, more than twice today’s level, and this is still rather conservative next to some previous periods of comparable length. A repeat of the growth of 1950–1990, for instance, would likely result in a GWP in the $250–350 trillion range. And of course, if one goes in for that sort of thinking, the growth we could realize if the predictions of futurists like Ray Kurzweil pan out would absolutely explode those numbers.

#### Growth gets off the rock

Robin Hason, Professor of economics at George Mason University, Oct. 18, 2001, http://hanson.gmu.edu/wildideas.html

If our growth does not stop, it must continue. And it cannot continue this long without enabling and encouraging massive space colonization. Spatial/material growth requires it, technical growth enables it, and economic growth induces technical growth.

### Capitalism Good – Environment

#### Environmental quality improving now under cap – disproves internal link between the two

Terry L. Anderson, executive director of the Property and Environment Research Center, a think tank focusing on market solutions to environmental problems, 2004, “You Have to Admit It's Getting Better: From Economic Prosperity to Environmental Quality”

Bjørn Lomborg, determined to prove Julian Simon wrong and to verify the doomsday-visions of the kind that permeated The Global 2000 Report, enlisted ten of his “sharpest students” to comb through the empirical data (Lomborg 2001, xix) on long-term temporal trends in human and environmental well-being. Much to his surprise, they found that although the population continues to grow, albeit at a decelerating pace, the state of humanity has never been better, that the average person on the globe has never been less hungry, better educated, richer, healthier, and longer-lived than today.1 No less important, not only is human well-being advancing but, in many cases, so seems to be the state of the environment, especially in the rich countries of the world.

#### Despite small flaws, Capitalism remains the only system capable of providing environmentally neutral effects.

Martin W. Lewis, Director of International Relations, Stanford University, “Green Delusions: An Environmentalist Critique of Radical Environmentalism,”1992 pg. 9

"Primal" economies have rarely been as harmonized with nature as they are depicted; many have actually been highly destructive. Similarly, decentralized, small-scale political structures can be just as violent and ecologically wasteful as large-scale, centralized ones. Small is sometimes ugly, and big is occasionally beautiful. Technological advance, for its part, is clearly necessary if we are to develop less harmful ways of life and if we are to progress as a human community. And finally, capitalism, despite its social flaws, presents the only economic system resilient and efficient enough to see the development of a more benign human presence on the earth.

#### Research shows that environmental quality rises with increased income

Terry L. Anderson, executive director of the Property and Environment Research Center, a think tank focusing on market solutions to environmental problems, 2004, “You Have to Admit It's Getting Better: From Economic Prosperity to Environmental Quality”

The doomsayers contend that such growth will ultimately deplete natural resources and destroy the environment, but Lomborg finds positive correlations between economic growth and environmental quality. He correlates the World Bank’s environmental sustainability index with gross domestic product per capita across 117 nations, concluding that “higher income in general is correlated with higher environmental sustainability” (Lomborg 2001, 32). This idea is known as the “environmental Kuznets curve,” based on Nobel laureate Simon Kuznets’s earlier work on patterns of economic growth. Measuring environmental quality (for example, air quality) on the vertical axis and economic performance (for example, the gross domestic product, or GDP) on the horizontal axis, the relationship displays a J-curve. At lower levels of income, environmental quality can deteriorate as people trade environmental quality for economic growth. But as Bruce Yandle, Maya Vijayaraghavan, and Madhusudan Bhattarai review in Chapter 3, all studies show that the relationship between environmental quality and economic performance becomes positive at higher levels of income because environmental quality is what economists call an income-elastic good. In other words, if income rises 10 percent, the demand for environmental quality rises more than 10 percent. Generally, the (annual) income level at which the turning point occurs is between $4,000 and $8,000, with the demand for water quality turning upward at lower levels of income than the income levels at which the demand for endangered species preservation turns upward.

### Capitalism Good – Transition Wars

#### Alternatives to Capitalism end in war and genocide

Rudolph Rummel, prof. emeritus of political science at the University of Hawaii

Rudolph, 2004, “The Killing Machine that is Marxism”

Of all religions, secular and otherwise, that of Marxism has been by far the bloodiest – bloodier than the Catholic Inquisition, the various Catholic crusades, and the Thirty Years War between Catholics and Protestants. In practice, Marxism has meant bloody terrorism, deadly purges, lethal prison camps and murderous forced labor, fatal deportations, man-made famines, extrajudicial executions and fraudulent show trials, outright mass murder and genocide. In total, Marxist regimes murdered nearly 110 million people from 1917 to 1987. For perspective on this incredible toll, note that all domestic and foreign wars during the 20th century killed around 35 million. That is, when Marxists control states, Marxism is more deadly then all the wars of the 20th century, including World Wars I and II, and the Korean and Vietnam Wars. And what did Marxism, this greatest of human social experiments, achieve for its poor citizens, at this most bloody cost in lives? Nothing positive. It left in its wake an economic, environmental, social and cultural disaster.

#### Alternatives to capitalism empirically cause mass death

Rudolph Rummel, prof. emeritus of political science at the University of Hawaii

Rudolph, 2004, “The Killing Machine that is Marxism”

What is astonishing is that this "currency" of death by Marxism is not thousands or even hundreds of thousands, but millions of deaths. This is almost incomprehensible – it is as though the whole population of the American New England and Middle Atlantic States, or California and Texas, had been wiped out. And that around 35 million people escaped Marxist countries as refugees was an unequaled vote against Marxist utopian pretensions. Its equivalent would be everyone fleeing California, emptying it of all human beings. There is a supremely important lesson for human life and welfare to be learned from this horrendous sacrifice to one ideology: No one can be trusted with unlimited power. The more power a government has to impose the beliefs of an ideological or religious elite, or decree the whims of a dictator, the more likely human lives and welfare will be sacrificed. As a government's power is more unrestrained, as its power reaches into all corners of culture and society, the more likely it is to kill its own citizens.

#### Capitalism prevents war

Doug Bandow, a senior fellow at the Cato Institute, 10-26,-2005 “A Capitalist Peace?”, “<http://www.reason.com/news/show/32985.html>”

There are a number of reasons why economics appears to trump politics. The shift from statist mercantilism to high-tech capitalism has transformed the economics behind war. Markets generate economic opportunities that make war less desirable. Territorial aggrandizement no longer provides the best path to riches. Free-flowing capital markets and other aspects of globalization simultaneously draw nations together and raise the economic price of military conflict, because the political destabilization resulting from war deters profitable investment and trade. Moreover, sanctions, which interfere with economic prosperity, provides a coercive step short of war to achieve foreign policy ends.